VISIT…

Wenying Jiang
姜文英

Acquisition of Word Order in Chinese as a Foreign Language

Mouton de Gruyter
SOLA
Studies on Language Acquisition
38

Acquisition of Word Order in Chinese as a Foreign Language

Studies on Language Acquisition 38

Editor

Peter Jordens

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Acquisition of Word Order in Chinese as a Foreign Language

by

Wenying Jiang
姜文英

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin.

∞ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jiang, Wenying, 1965–
Acquisition of word order in Chinese as a foreign language / by Wenying Jiang.
p. cm. – (Studies on language acquisition ; 38)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-3-11-021618-9 (hardcover : alk. paper)
1. Chinese language – Study and teaching – Foreign speakers. 2. Chinese language – Word order. 3. Second language acquisition. I. Title.
PL1065.J53 2009
495.1'8007–dc22
2009027760

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

ISBN 978-3-11-021618-9
ISSN 1861-4248

© Copyright 2009 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin.
All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.
Cover design: Sigurd Wendland, Berlin.
Printed in Germany.

Forword

The beginnings of this book can be traced back to the first year of my teaching Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) in 2002 at The University of Queensland, Brisbane Australia. Comparing with my previous experience in teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), one thing stood out with my CFL students. They found Chinese word order very challenging. Word order errors frequently occurred in their oral presentations, written assignments and exam papers. When I tried to explain those word order errors to them, I found myself powerless in making my explanation as explicit and convincing as I expected. It was difficult even for me to describe and differentiate those various Chinese word order errors. The desire of providing a clearer and more convincing explanation to my students regarding their word order errors inspired me to conduct my doctoral study on acquisition of Chinese word order by native English speakers. This book is based on my doctoral thesis completed in the year of 2006. Now I must acknowledge my deep gratitude to my students who inspired me for pursuing this research and my supervisors who guided me through this research project.

I am fully aware that, despite my effort to gather advice and assistance to make this book both readable and rigorous, it may have many flaws. While thinking "to err is human", I take ultimate responsibility to any flaws. It brings me great comfort that at least I learn to know how to describe various Chinese L2 word order errors and to convincingly explain them to my students after completing this research project.

I would very much like to acknowledge my gratitude to my husband, Professor Bingqiang (Bill) Zhao, and our daughter, Shuiqing (Sherry) Zhao, for their love, support and understanding throughout the years in which we travelled from one country to another studying and teaching overseas. I would like to dedicate this work to them.

Wenying Jiang

Edmonton Canada, May 2008

Table of contents

Foreword v
List of tables xiii
List of abbreviations xv

Chapter One: Introduction 1

1. Status of second language acquisition research in Chinese 1
2. Importance of word order in grammar 2
3. Centrality of word order in Chinese 3
   3.1. Role of word order in Chinese 3
   3.2. Functions of word order variations in Chinese 5
4. Cross-linguistic comparison of Chinese and English word orders 6
   4.1. Canonical word order 7
   4.2. Prominence 9
   4.3. Constraint 10
   4.4. Principal branching direction 11
5. The problem: how to describe and explain Chinese L2 word order errors? 12
6. Objectives and research questions 14
7. Significance of the study 15
8. An overview of the book 16
9. Terminology issues in this study 17
   9.1. The first language / mother tongue / native language (NL) and L1 18
   9.2. Second language, foreign language, target language (TL) and L2 18
   9.3. Acquisition versus learning 19
   9.4. Competence versus performance 20
   9.5. Positive transfer, negative transfer and cross-linguistic influence 20
   9.6. Input versus intake 21
   9.7. Interlanguage 21
   9.8. L2 error 22

Chapter Two: Literature review (1)
Theoretical approaches applied in L2 word order acquisition research 23

1. The Universal Grammar approach. 24
   1.1. Theoretical foundations 24
   1.2. Theoretical assumptions 26
   1.3. Investigating L2 word order acquisition 26
   1.4. Achievements 29
   1.5. Adequacy for understanding L2 word order errors. 30
2. The Processability Theory approach 32
   2.1. Theoretical foundations 32
   2.2. Theoretical assumptions 33
   2.3. Investigating L2 word order acquisition 34
   2.4. Achievements 37
   2.5. Adequacy for understanding L2 word order errors. 37
3. The Competition Model approach 39
   3.1. Theoretical foundations 39
   3.2. Theoretical assumptions 39
   3.3. Investigating L2 word order acquisition 40
   3.4. Achievements 41
   3.5. Adequacy for understanding L2 word order errors. 43
4. The Cognitive Functionalist Approach 45
   4.1. Development of this approach 45
   4.2. The three core areas of Cognitive Functionalist Grammar 48
      4.2.1. Space and Time 48
      4.2.2. Categorization 50
      4.2.3. Iconicity 53
5. Conclusion 55

Chapter Three: Literature review (2)
Chinese L2 word order acquisition, word order errors and word order principles 57

1. Studies of Chinese L2 word order acquisition 58
   1.1. Yu's 1986 study 59
   1.2. Xu's 1988 study 61
   1.3. Hu's 1992 study 63
   1.4. Li's 1999 study 65
2. Studies on Chinese L2 word order errors 70

2.1. Error Analysis (EA) in Chinese L2 research 70
2.2. Ko's (1997) word order error taxonomy 72
2.3. Starting point for a comprehensive Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy 76
3. Explanatory value of PTS and WBP for Chinese L2 word order errors 77
3.1. Time and place words 77
3.2. Modification structures 79
3.3. Topic-comment relations 80
3.4. Inappropriateness 80
4. Underlying principles governing Chinese word order and its variations 81
4.1. Introduction 82
4.2. Word order principles 82
4.3. Demonstrations of Chinese word order principles and sub-principles 86
4.3.1. Conceptual principles 87
4.3.2. Functional principles 97
4.3.3. Grammatical principle 102
4.3.4. Empathetic principle 103
4.4. Relationship between different domains of principles 106
5. The proposed criterion for categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors 107
6. Conclusion 109

Chapter Four: Research methodology 111

1. Broad methodological concerns 111
2. A cross-sectional research design 112
2.1. Comparison of longitudinal and cross-sectional designs . . 112
2.2. Justification for a cross-sectional research design 114
3. Error Analysis (EA) 115
3.1. Importance of EA to this study 115
3.2. Development of EA 116
3.3. Limitations of EA 118
3.4. EA in Chinese language acquisition studies 119
3.4.1. Collection of a sample of learner language 120
3.4.2. Identification of errors 123
3.4.3. Description of errors 126
3.4.4. Explanation of errors 129
4. Conclusion 133

Chapter Five: The study 135

1. Data collection 135
   1.1. Participants 135
   1.2. Written productive data 136
      1.2.1. Letter 136
      1.2.2. Web-diary 137
      1.2.3. Essay 138
2. Data analysis 138
   2.1. Unit of analysis 139
   2.2. Procedure of analysis 139
3. Conclusion 140

Chapter Six: A principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors 141

1. Introduction 142
   1.1. Revisiting research questions 142
   1.2. Restatement of earlier findings 143
2. Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy 144
3. A principle-based taxonomy of word order errors 146
   3.1. Inter-rater reliability 147
      3.1.1. Inter-rater reliability: word order error identification 147
      3.1.2. Inter-rater reliability: word order error categorization 147
   3.2. Need for further refinement of word order error types . . . 147
   3.3. The existing categories 150
   3.4. New categories emerging from the data 150
      3.4.1. A new domain: the Sociocultural domain 151
      3.4.2. A new principle: the Greenberg Pattern Principle (GPP) 152
      3.4.3. Seven new sub-principles 154
      3.4.4. Eleven new sub-principle types 164
   3.5. The Other category 174
   3.6. The taxonomy 175
4. Characteristics and significance of the principle-based taxonomy 177
   4.1. Characteristics of the principle-based taxonomy 177
   4.2. Significance of the principle-based taxonomy 178
   4.3. Explanation for Chinese L2 word order errors 179
5. Conclusion 181

Chapter Seven: Chinese L2 word order errors: Relative frequency of occurrence 185

1. Calculation method of word order error rates. 185
2. Error rates for all word order error categories in the new taxonomy 186
   2.1. Overall word order error rates. 186
   2.2. Word order error rates according to domain categories. . . 188
   2.3. Word order error rates according to principle categories. . 190
   2.4. Word order error rates according to sub-principle categories. 192
   2.5. Word order error rates according to sub-principle type categories. 195
3. Conclusion 197

Chapter Eight: Conclusion 199

1. A brief review of research objectives 199
2. Summary of the findings and contributions. 200
   2.1. Main findings. 200
   2.2. Main contributions 201
3. Limitations 202
   3.1. Limitations of EA in SLA research 202
   3.2. Limitations of sampling. 202
4. Pedagogical implications of the findings 204
   4.1. Teaching grammatical principles at elementary level. 205
   4.2. Teaching conceptual principles at intermediate level 206
   4.3. Teaching functional principles at advanced level 206
5. Suggested topics for further research. 207
   5.1. Instruction effect of the underlying word order principles 208
   5.2. A longitudinal study on Chinese L2 word order development 208
   5.3. Study on criteria for categorizing other types of errors in Chinese L2. 208
6. Concluding remarks 209

References 211

Appendix 231

Index 317

List of tables

Table 1.1	Cross-linguistic comparisons of Chinese and English word orders
Table 2.1	Categorization of nouns and verbs in prototype theory
Table 3.1	Four studies of Chinese word order acquisition found in LLBA and MLA
Table 3.2	Tabulation of the word order categories according to their semantic characteristics and word order
Table 3.3	Chinese L2 error types and their percentages in Ko (1997)
Table 3.4	Ko's (1997) Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy
Table 3.5	Starting point for establishing taxonomy of word order errors
Table 3.6	Hu's (1995) categorization of Chinese word order principles
Table 3.7	Chinese word order principles revised from Hu's categorization
Table 3.8	Ho's (1993) further classification of some Chinese word order principles
Table 3.9	Summary of Chinese word order principles and sub-principles
Table 3.10	Word order error categories and principles & sub-principles violated
Table 4.1	Comparison of longitudinal and cross-sectional designs in SLA research
Table 4.2	Factors to consider when collecting samples of learner language
Table 4.3	Factors relevant to the Chinese L2 sample collected in this study
Table 5.1	Summary of data corpus from Chinese L2 learners
Table 6.1	Number and percentage of word order errors according to Ko's taxonomy
Table 6.2	Existing and newly emerging word order error categories
Table 6.3	A principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors

Table 7.1 A four-layered taxonomy of word order error categories and error rates
Table 7.2 Word order error rates according to domain categories
Table 7.3 Word order error rates according to principle categories
Table 7.4 Word order error rates according to sub-principle categories
Table 7.5 Word order error rates according to sub-principle type categories

List of abbreviations

Abbreviations used in the book:

CA	Contrastive Analysis
CD	Communicative Dynamism
CFL	Chinese as a Foreign Language
CM	The Competition Model
EA	Error Analysis
ESL	English as a Second Language
FL	Foreign Language
GB	Chomsky's Government and Binding Theory
GWO	Grammatical Word Order
L1	First Language
L2	Second/Foreign Language
LAD	Language Acquisition Device
M	Measure Word in Chinese
NL	Native Language
NP	Noun Phrase
PT	Processability Theory
PWO	Pragmatic Word Order
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SOV	Subject-Object-Verb
SVO	Subject-Verb-Object
TL	Target Language
UG	Universal Grammar

Important Chinese word order principles identified:

CBC	The Principle of Container-Before-Contained
EP	The Empathetic Principle
GPP	The Greenberg Pattern Principle
MBH	The Principle of Modifier Before Head
PCD	The Principle of Communicative Dynamism
PF	The Principle of Focus
PTS	The Principle of Temporal Sequence
WBP	The Principle of Whole Before Part

Chapter 1: Introduction

"It is often said that all Chinese grammar is syntax, all Chinese syntax is word order, and therefore all Chinese grammar is word order" (Chao, 1968, p. 260).

1. Status of second language acquisition research in Chinese[1]

In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), the majority of empirical studies have focused on English and various European languages. Despite a large body of literature in this field, there remains a paucity of studies on Chinese second/foreign language (L2) acquisition. At present, research in Chinese L2 acquisition does not match the increasing demand to learn Chinese as an L2 and the consequent need for understanding how L2 learners acquire Chinese, which is now the fastest growing foreign language (FL) in Japan, South Korea, the United States, Canada and Australia (Goh, 1999). Not only is the number of studies of Chinese L2 acquisition limited, but also empirical studies are rare (Polio, 1994; Zhang, 2001). Qian's (1999) comprehensive bibliography of studies on Chinese L2 acquisition examined more than 100 journals in China over a 20-year period between 1977 and 1998 and found no more than 10 articles that were data-based studies.

Ko (1997) has also noted the paucity of literature in Chinese L2 acquisition research. In her words:

> Much research has been done on such topics as the usage and significance of particles and articles in Chinese language structure such as the word ba (把), and the usage of de (的) and le (了). Debates over the pros and cons of different phonetic systems such as *Pinyin* (a Romanization system adopted by The People's Republic of China) versus GR (Gwoyeu Romatzyh, another Romanization system that differentiates among tones in Chinese) or arguments over the merits of simplified characters over complicated characters have been spirited. Yet issues relevant to second language acquisition or teaching pedagogy are basically lacking or missing from the research literature (p. 4).

1. In this book Chinese is used to refer to the officially recognized standard language in Mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, known as Mandarin overseas, *Putonghua* 'the common language' in Mainland China and *Guoyu* 'national language' in Taiwan.

Research on the Chinese language, it seems, is largely confined to linguistic studies. The need for more research in Chinese SLA is compelling. In particular, research in Chinese L2 word order acquisition requires special attention because Chinese relies heavily on word order for information structuring at the sentence level, due to the lack of alternative devices such as verb endings that indicate tense and aspect. This book makes an effort to fill this gap by conducting word order acquisition research in Chinese as a foreign language (CFL). Specifically, it investigates word order errors made by English-speaking learners of Chinese.

2. Importance of word order in grammar

Word order refers to the temporal or linear sequence of words in a sentence, clause or phrase. Hudson (2000) defines word order as one of the three essential aspects of syntax, which includes grouping, function and word order. Among the three components of syntax, word order has received the most attention from researchers.

The importance of word order in information structuring of a sentence lies in the fact that "Word order is one of the primary devices languages offer speakers to express who does what to whom" (Gershkoff-Stowe & Goldin-Medow, 2002, p. 377). For example, the sentence "A hates B" describes a very different situation from "B hates A." Given the important role word order plays in a language system, the study of word order has long captivated linguists (Bloomfield, 1933; Gershkoff-Stowe & Goldin-Medow, 2002; Sapir, 1921; Tomlin, 1986).

As a central aspect of SLA, word order acquisition can be challenging to L2 learners because the word order features of their L1 and L2 are often different (Li, 1999). Moreover, problems remain in describing and explaining these word order differences. In Tomlin's (1986) words:

> The new second language learner often is intrigued as much by word order differences in the new language as by any other feature except, perhaps, phonology. Word order, thus, represents the most overtly noticeable feature of cross-linguistic syntax, yet at the same time it remains a tantalizing problem, both to describe the pertinent facts of word order variability and to provide some explanation for the great diversity one can see cross-linguistically (p. 1).

One of the most marked differences between Chinese and English is the role played by word order. Word order has more complicated roles

in Chinese than in English in information structuring of a sentence. The following section demonstrates the centrality of word order in Chinese information structuring.

3. Centrality of word order in Chinese

Some languages rely more on word order than others for the interpretation of sentences or utterances. Chinese is "one of those languages that rely heavily on word order as an underlying marking feature for meaning" (Ho, 1993, p. 138). The recognition of the importance of word order in Chinese by researchers is evident in Chao's (1968) quote at the beginning of this book. In the following, the salience of Chinese word order roles and functions to information structuring of sentences is explained and demonstrated with examples.

3.1. Role of word order in Chinese

Chinese syntax has a number of unique features. In contrast to languages such as English, it stands out as a language without a great number of affixational morphological processes (Chao, 1968; Chen, 1995; Ho, 1993). There are few overt syntactic expressions of tenses, subject-verb agreement, case, gender or number markings, as found in inflectional languages. For example, the verb *lai* 'to come' remains *lai* no matter whether the action happened yesterday, today or will happen tomorrow. It remains *lai* in form when the subject is of the third person and singular, or the first person and plural. So, a verb itself is consistent in form. Another good example of verb consistency is that the variations of the English linking verb 'be' – am, is, are, was and were – have just one Chinese counterpart, *shi*. Besides verbs, a Chinese noun or pronoun does not undergo any change regardless of whether it is used as a subject or object. For instance, *women* 'we' stays *women* in form whether it is a subject 'we' or an object 'us'. The lack of affixational morphology also means that counterfactual or subjunctive mood sentences (e.g. if I were you) are not expressed with explicit grammatical devices. English expressions such as 'Can you?' and 'Could you?' correspond to the same form in Chinese, and 'if I am you' would be just as acceptable in Chinese grammar as 'if I were you'. The lack of overt syntactic expressions of tenses in a Chinese verb, agent-patient roles in a Chinese pronoun

and subjunctive mood is compensated by word order variations in a sentence for the information structuring of the sentence (Kirkpatrick, 1993).

Word order is one of the most powerful devices used in Chinese to indicate subtle change of meaning. For instance, purely through word order, the following *shunkouliur* 'Chinese doggerel' in (1) suggests that the citizens of the provinces mentioned differ as to their tolerance of spicy food.

(1) 四川 人 **不 怕 辣**; 湖北 人 **辣 不 怕**; 湖南 人 **怕 不 辣**。[2]
Sichuan ren ***bu pa la***; *Hubei ren* ***la bu pa***; *Hunan ren* ***pa bu la***.
Sichuan person **not fear spicy**; Hubei person **spicy not fear**;
Hunan person **fear not spicy**.
Sichuaners do not (fear their food) being spicy; (Their food) being spicy is not a fearful matter to Hubeiners; Hunaners fear that (their food) is not spicy.

Notice especially the last three syllables of each clause. The order suggests that people from Hunan province tolerate the spiciest food; people from Hubei are next, followed by people from Sichuan. The very subtle differences in meaning are expressed by a mere rearrangement of the word order of the last three characters in each clause: *bu* 'not', *pa* 'fear' and *la* 'spicy food'. The meaning differences relate to placement of negation, verb and noun. The first word order *bu pa la* 'negation + verb + noun' is conventional in expressing 'people do not fear something'. The second word order *la bu pa* 'noun + negation + verb' emphasizes the noun, which connotes that *la* is the least people fear. In the third word order *pa bu la* 'verb + negation + noun', the 'negation' does not negate the verb, but the noun. This word order connotes that people love spicy food and that they 'fear' their food not being spicy. Unfortunately, the differences are not explicit in the English translations, especially the meanings of the first two clauses, which are virtually indistinguishable in English.

2. The first line of the example is written in Chinese characters. The second line is the same sentence written in *pinyin*, the official Chinese phonetic system used in the People's Republic of China. This is followed by a word-for-word or literal English translation in the third line. The last line in the example provides an idiomatic English translation. All the Chinese examples throughout the book follow the same pattern.

Word order can therefore serve as an important syntactic device in Chinese for information structuring. Rearrangement of word order not only brings meaning change but also shows the skillful manipulation of the words in a sentence. Chen (1995) summarizes the crucial role of word order in Chinese as follows:

> First, Chinese is a syllable-timed language, which means that stress does not play as important a role in conveying information status as that of stress-timed languages. Second, the notions of tense and aspect are not marked on the Chinese verb, so Chinese cannot rely on tense and aspect markers to structure its information, as languages like English can. Third, there is no article system in Chinese to mark definiteness and indefiniteness, which suggests that Chinese lacks yet another means to manipulate its information structure. These and other facts which I have not touched upon seem to force the Chinese language to rely heavily on the linear order of sentence elements for information structuring purposes (p. 218).

In the following, the centrality of word order in Chinese information structuring is further explained and demonstrated through its functions.

3.2. Functions of word order variations in Chinese

Chinese word order not only marks grammatical functions as English word order does (in that word order indicates which noun phrase (NP) is subject and which is object), it also marks other functions such as definiteness/indefiniteness for nouns and cohesiveness in discourse (Chu, 1998). The following pair of three-word sentences with identical words and minimal difference in the ordering of two words (Li & Thompson, 1985, p. 510) illustrates how word order signals definiteness and indefiniteness:

(2) 来 人 了。
Lai ren le.
Come person LE
Some person/people has/have come.

(3) 人 来 了。
Ren lai le.
Person come LE
The person/people (we are expecting) has/have come.

What is interesting is that the difference in meaning between the two sentences, that is, *definiteness* versus *indefiniteness* of the noun phrases (*some person|people* versus *the person|people*), is not signaled by definite and indefinite articles as in English, but by changing the ordering between the two words *lai* 'come' and *ren* 'person'. If word order plays such a crucial role in interpreting short sentences like (2) and (3), it would be expected to convey more complex information in longer, more complicated sentences. Discourse and its context add even more complexity to Chinese word order variations because they play such an important part in determining the actual word order of sentences (see Hu, 1992). Thus, the role of word order in Chinese is complicated and it is not surprising that adult native-English-speaking learners of Chinese tend to produce many word order errors (Ko, 1997).

Studies show that, compared to other L2 linguistic features, L2 word order is more influenced by L1 word order (James, 1998). James maintains, "misordering is often the result of learners relying on carrying out word-for-word translation of native language surface structures when producing written or spoken utterances in the TL [target language]" (p. 110). Thus, in order to better understand Chinese L2 word order errors by adult native-English-speaking learners, it is necessary to briefly compare the word order features of their L1 (English) with those of their L2 (Chinese).

4. Cross-linguistic comparison of Chinese and English word orders

In SLA, it is generally accepted that adult learners learn their L2 by using their L1 as a tool (Jiang, 2004; Newmeyer, 1996). With highly developed cognition and conceptualization of the world based on their L1, adult learners cannot avoid associating with their L1 when learning their L2. Knowledge of the similarities and differences in word order in learners' L1 and L2 will be of great help in understanding L2 word order errors.

Firbas (1992) emphasizes that the word-order system of a language can be understood in a more comprehensive way if it is compared with that of another language, preferably one of different structure. Based on Li and Thompson (1976, 1981), Lust and Chien (1984), Rutherford,

(1983), Sun and Givón (1985), Tai (1973), Thompson (1978) and Tomlin (1986), the word order features of Chinese and English are summarized in Table 1.1. Each of the four features listed will be discussed below.

Table 1.1 Cross-linguistic comparisons of Chinese and English word orders

Features	**Chinese**	**English**
Canonical word order (CWO)	Subject-Verb-Object (SVO)/ Subject-Object-Verb (SOV)	SVO
Prominence	Topic-prominent	Subject-prominent
Constraint	Pragmatic word order (PWO)	Grammatical word order (GWO)
Principal branching direction	Principally left-branching (PLB)	Principally right-branching (PRB)

4.1. Canonical word order

Greenberg (1963, 1966) lays out ways of classifying languages according to the position of the three nuclear constituents of a declarative transitive clause, namely, subject (S), verb (V) and object (O). Following Greenberg (1966), Tomlin (1986) identifies the relative frequencies of the six basic canonical word orders (CWO) of human languages, which are: SOV = SVO > VSO > VOS = OVS > OSV. This indicates that the CWO of most human languages is either SOV or SVO. It needs to be pointed out that in describing a language as SVO, one only refers to the word order of its most prevalent and unmarked declarative sentences. Other word orders, such as OSV, may also exist in complex syntactic structures or in order to achieve a pragmatic function. For example, the OSV order in the compound sentence "Mary I like while Jane I dislike" is used to express a contrast.

Typologically speaking, English is a rigid SVO language (Thompson, 1978). As Thompson describes, "English is a language in which basic grammatical relations are signaled by word order. Specifically, it is a language in which there must be a noun phrase [NP] immediately preceding the verb in main clauses and that noun phrase, if unmarked, is the subject" (p. 25). Structures with a 'dummy' or 'empty' subject "it" demonstrate the rigid SVO word order in English. For example, in sen-

tences like "it is raining", a 'dummy' subject 'it' is required to occupy the subject position even if it carries no lexical meaning.

There is heated debate over whether the CWO of Chinese is SVO or SOV (Ho, 1993). Three positions have been articulated in the literature. The first position is represented by Tai (1973). Tai proposes that the CWO of Chinese is SOV on the basis of the features associated with SOV languages defined by Greenberg. These features include the sequence of modifiers before the modified, frequent use of postpositions and the use of interrogatory helping words at the end of Yes-No questions (Ho, 1993). Since all these features are found in Chinese, Tai concludes that Chinese is an SOV language. Li and Thompson (1976, 1981) propose a second view that Chinese has undergone a process of evolution from an SVO language to an SOV language, as characterized by the frequent use of the *ba*-construction[3], less rigidity of a definite NP before the verb and an indefinite NP after the verb, and the optional positioning of prepositional phrases before or after the verb. There are also linguists who do not consider Chinese word order to be SOV or in the process of transition from SVO to SOV. Authors that hold a third position that Chinese is predominantly an SVO language include Light (1979), McGinnis (1988), Lu (1980), Mei (1980), Chu (1984), Sun and Givón (1985) amongst others. Their position is supported by a number of statistical studies undertaken calculating the frequency of SVO sentences (e.g. Sun & Givón 1985; Wang, 1988). Although many researchers claim that Chinese is predominantly an SVO language in terms of statistical predominance and unmarked surface level word order, it is evident that difficulties arise in deciding what language type best describes Chinese as the language manifests both SVO and SOV characteristics.

Furthermore, even when Chinese exhibits an SVO word order, as English does, the determining factors behind the surface SVO order are

3. *Ba* is a Chinese function word. It is usually regarded as a preposition or a co-verb. The *Ba*-construction is a unique syntactic structure in Chinese. It is often employed when people want to emphasize what happened or what should happen to an object. The word order of a *Ba*-construction is: S-*Ba*-O-V. The following example emphasizes the importance of the object "the money":

   你 把 钱 带 上.
   Ni Ba qian dai shang.

   You *Ba* money bring up
   Please do take the money with you.

different in the two languages (Chao, 1968; Huang, 1982; Mangione, 1982). These factors include 'prominence', 'constraint' and 'principal branching direction', which are all different in Chinese and English. These are discussed below.

4.2. Prominence

On the typological continuum ranging from *subject-prominent* to *topic-prominent* languages, English and Chinese are said to typify two respective extremes (Li & Thompson, 1976). The majority of linguists working on the Chinese language support the view that both topic and subject exist in both Chinese and English as separate grammatical notions and that both can exist in the same sentence (Huang, 1982; Li, 1990; Li & Thompson, 1976, 1981; Ning, 1993; Qu, 1994; Shi, 2000; Shyu, 1995; Tsao, 1979, 1990). However, Chinese differs from English in that while the syntactic category of *subject* is basic and central to the English grammatical system, it is peripheral and secondary to that of Chinese. In the Chinese case, the central role is played by the category of *topic*. For example, if one compares both English and Chinese answers to the same question, "Have you returned that book?", the answer in English shows a subject-predicate structure in (4) while the answer in Chinese allows several different topic-comment structures in (5):

(4) A: Have you returned that book?

B: Yes, I did. Subject + Predicate

(5) A: 你 还 那 本 书 了 吗?
Ni huan na ben shu le ma?
You return that book *LE ma*
Have you returned that book?

B: 还 了。
Huan le.
Return *LE*
Returned. Comment

C: 书 还 了。
Shu huan le.
Book return *LE*
The book has been returned Topic + Comment

D: 书 我 还 了。
Shu wo huan le.
Book I return *LE*
The book, I have returned it. Topic + Subject + Comment

#E: 是的，我 还 那 本 书 了。
Shi de, wo huan na ben shu le.
Yes, I return that book LE
Yes, I did return that book. Subject + Predicate

The # symbol preceding (5)E indicates that the sentence is inappropriate in context although it is grammatically correct independently. Examples (4) and (5) demonstrate that in *subject-prominent* languages like English, a subject is essential for a sentence to remain grammatical while in *topic-prominent* languages like Chinese many grammatical sentences are subjectless. As a consequence, adult native English-speaking learners of Chinese may tend to use more subjects than necessary in Chinese production due to their L1 influence (Ko, 1997). Both Jin (1994) and Jung (2004) have confirmed the typological influence of L1 in learners' L2 production: English learners of Chinese in Jin's study and English learners of Korean in Jung's study do transfer their *subject-prominent* L1 features in *topic-prominent* L2 learning. This type of transfer often leads to L2 errors.

4.3. Constraint

As Li and Thompson (1981) point out, the order in which major constituents of a sentence occur in Chinese is governed to a large extent by considerations of semantic or pragmatic factors, while English is governed mainly by grammatical functions. Based on the constraints of word order, Thompson (1978) differentiates languages into *pragmatic word order* (PWO) languages and *grammatical word order* (GWO) languages. In PWO languages like Chinese, it is pragmatic or discourse factors that at least partially determine the order of canonical constituents in a sentence. In contrast, in GWO languages like English the positioning of canonical constituents primarily obeys grammatical or syntactic constraints at the sentence level (Rutherford, 1983; Thompson, 1978). In other words, word order in GWO languages is "conditioned only by the syntactic and semantic relationships within the sentence" while in

PWO languages, the word order of a sentence is also conditioned by "a larger context", that is, discourse (Kitić, 2002, p. 304).

Due to their different constraints, it is often said that Chinese is *discourse*-oriented while English is *sentence*-oriented (McGinnis, 1999; Tsao, 1979; Zhang, 1995). This indicates that the basic functional unit in Chinese is *discourse*, while in English it is *sentence*. Communication strategies, such as politeness, are conveyed in English at a sentence level by making a sentence longer or using the subjunctive mood while in Chinese they are conveyed through linguistic units larger than the sentence, namely discourse (McGinnis, 1999; Zhang, 1995). For example, Zhang (1995) finds that in English if one wishes to borrow a camera from a friend, using the request '*Could I possibly borrow your camera?*' is more polite than '*Can I borrow your camera?*' In Chinese, however, politeness is not achieved by making a sentence longer or using subjunctive mood. Such a request of borrowing a camera is usually achieved by alternative strategies that involve a discourse instead of a sentence. Chinese native speakers tend to first find out whether the friend will possibly use his/her camera by asking questions like '*Are you planning to go out sightseeing at all?*' before they actually make the request. Sometimes people just express their wish of having a camera instead of making the request directly. It is considered more polite to leave the opportunity for the friend to offer lending his/her camera. Given that the basic functional unit in Chinese is discourse, the word order of each sentence of the discourse is not determined only by the sentence, but also by the discourse.

The two word order features of "prominence" and "constraint" discussed above seem to correlate to each other (Rutherford, 1989). Topic-prominent languages are often pragmatically constrained (PWO) while subject-prominent languages are often grammatically constrained (GWO) (Rutherford, 1989). Chinese represents the former while English represents the latter. Due to these typological differences, English learners find Chinese word order acquisition challenging (Ko, 1997; Li, 1999).

4.4. Principal branching direction

Apart from major constituents, namely S, V and O, a sentence may also include modifiers such as adjectives, adverbs and relative clauses. The ordering of these modifiers is also very important. Indeed for this study

their order may be more important than the ordering of the major constituents because many Chinese sentences share the same SVO word order as English sentences. The typological ordering difference of modifiers in the two languages is characterised by the notion of "Principal Branching Direction" (PBD) (Lust & Chien, 1984, p. 54). Chinese is a "*principally left-branching*" (PLB) language in that relative clauses and subordinate clauses position to the *left* of their head, while English is "*principally right-branching*" (PRB) in that relative clauses and subordinate clauses position to the *right* of their head (Lust & Chien, 1984, p. 54). This is demonstrated by example (6).

(6) 那 个 说 中文 的 **女 孩 子** 是 我 妹妹。
*Na ge shuo zhongwen de **nü hai zi** shi wo meimei.*
That speak Chinese *de* **girl** is me younger sister
The girl who speaks Chinese is my younger sister.

The bold highlighted noun phrase (NP) in (6) is a head and the underlined relative clause modifies the head. In Chinese, the relative clause modifier is positioned to the *left* of the head while in English the relative clause modifier is positioned to the *right*. This difference causes problems for English-speaking learners particularly in learning the word order of Chinese relative clauses and the heads they modify.

In sum, four word order features, that is, the canonical word order, prominence, constraint and principal branching direction, have been compared in Chinese and English. Chinese exhibits both SVO and SOV features while English is a rigid SVO language. Chinese is a topic-prominent language while English is a subject-prominent language. Chinese is a PWO language while English is a GWO language. Chinese is principally left-branching while English is principally right-branching. Due to these differences, it is not surprising that English-speaking learners of Chinese encounter difficulties in their word order acquisition and often produce many Chinese word order errors.

5. The problem: how to describe and explain Chinese L2 word order errors

Given that the roles and functions of word order are more complicated in Chinese than in English, the acquisition of Chinese L2 word order by English speakers can be very challenging (Li, P., 1998; Li, W., 1999).

Ko (1997) provides a descriptive typology of the linguistic, lexical and syntactic errors produced by native-English-speaking students in their first, second, third and fourth years of Chinese instruction. Among the 506 errors she collected, eight categories were identified. The two most frequently occurring errors in her study were misuse of vocabulary (214, 42%) and improper word order (135, 27%). Ko's (1997) study confirms that native-English-speaking learners of Chinese do find word order challenging. Xie (1992) has also found that, even though some advanced learners of Chinese have native-like fluency in their utterances, their discourse organization and word order use "do not even come close to the level of native speakers" (p. 98).

The author's own observations gained from teaching Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) to Australian adult learners show that they have difficulty in acquiring Chinese word order. For example, the following sentences with word order errors are from second-year written Chinese examination papers.

(7a) # 你 可以 来 坐 火车。
Ni keyi lai zuo huoche.
You can come sit train
You can come by train.

(7b) 你 可以 坐 火车 来。
Ni keyi zuo huoche lai.
You can sit train come
You can come by train.

(8a) *我们 开[始] 五 点。
Women kaishi wu dian.
We begin five o'clock
We begin at five o'clock.

(8b) 我们 五 点 开始。
Women wu dian kaishi.
We five o'clock begin
We begin at five o'clock.

As mentioned earlier (p. 10), the # symbol preceding (7a) indicates that the sentence is inappropriate in context. An asterisk * preceding a sentence, as in (8a), indicates that the sentence is grammatically incorrect. In these cases, the grammatically correct or appropriate form of

the example is given as (b) following the same serial number, as shown in (7b) and (8b).

Many examples of word order errors, such as (7a) and (8a), appear in the students' oral presentations, written assignments and exam papers. However, no adequate means is available for Chinese L2 researchers and teachers to explicitly describe these word order errors. Without an explicit description, Chinese word order errors cannot be categorized and neither can they be adequately explained for instruction purposes.

Word order errors frequently occur in learners' Chinese L2 performance, however, no adequate means is available to describe them, nor are any adequate explanations available to account for them. In other words, while it is widely acknowledged that it is problematic for native-English-speaking learners to acquire Chinese word order, it is not clear what the exact problems are. In order for L2 researchers and teachers to better understand the process of Chinese L2 word order acquisition, word order errors that learners make need to be explored. Specifically, learners' word order errors need to be categorized in order to allow them to be more accurately described and explained. This book examines how Chinese L2 word order errors can be described explicitly and explained specifically in a pedagogical sense.

6. Objectives and research questions

Chinese native speakers have the language intuition or capacity to make use of word order variations in different contexts in order to achieve different communicative effects. Adult L2 learners, however, rarely possess such an intuition. They find acquiring Chinese word order challenging. As a result, word order errors frequently occur in learners' production. Categorizing these word order errors allows one to provide a more accurate description of them in Chinese L2 word order instruction.

The principal aim of this book is to develop a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. Taxonomy is defined in the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (1993) as "the branch of science that deals with classification". James (1998) maintains that "A mere listing of errors, including alphabetic ones, is not a taxonomy. A taxonomy must be organized according to certain constitutive criteria" (p. 102). Therefore, it is crucial to review available error taxonomies and search for a valid criterion or criteria to be used in classifying Chinese L2 word order errors. The taxonomy to be developed should be able to organize these

errors into a logical system of classification. Through this, explicit description of various Chinese L2 word order errors can be achieved, specific sources of these errors can be traced and instruction of Chinese L2 word order can be enhanced.

Building on the findings of relevant linguistic studies of Chinese word order and Chinese L2 word order acquisition, this book aims to achieve two principal objectives: (1) to critically evaluate existing word order error taxonomies; and (2) to develop a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors to enable explicit description and specific explanation. In so doing, this book will answer the following questions:

1. What Chinese L2 word order error taxonomies are available to date?
2. Are the categories in existing taxonomies theoretically motivated?
3. How can existing taxonomic categories be modified so as to better account for Chinese L2 word order errors?
4. How adequately do existing Chinese L2 word order error taxonomies account for the data collected from this cohort of learners?
5. Drawing on a proposed taxonomic framework, what categories of word order errors are made by the Chinese L2 learners in this study?
6. What are the relative frequencies of occurrence of various Chinese word order errors in this study?

7. Significance of the study

In answering the above research questions, this book will present a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. Such a taxonomy should enable L2 researchers and teachers to describe Chinese L2 word order errors more clearly and accurately, and should also provide insight into the acquisition process. The findings of the study will not only contribute to an understanding of the acquisition process of Chinese L2 word order, but will also provide a basis for Chinese L2 teachers to teach word order more effectively.

Word order errors are indispensable to learners since they can be "a device the learner uses in order to learn" (Selinker, 1992, p. 150). The establishment of an empirically based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors is a preliminary but crucial step towards a better understanding of the cognitive operating system at work in the Chinese L2 word order acquisition process. This taxonomy is also a prerequisite for

effective error-correction feedback, since it provides the base for a better understanding of the nature of Chinese L2 word order learning difficulties. Error-correction efforts do not always succeed (Ellis, 1994; James, 1998), presumably because feedback is not sufficiently clear for learners to understand. A comprehensive description of Chinese L2 word order errors, together with clear pedagogical information, has great potential for helping learners self-monitor, cope with and eventually overcome persistent errors more efficiently and effectively.

8. An overview of the book

The book consists of eight chapters. Chapter One discusses the status of SLA research in Chinese, the importance of word order in grammar, and the importance of word order in Chinese. It compares word order in Chinese and English and identifies potential Chinese L2 word order difficulties for adult native-English-speaking learners of Chinese. The objectives, research questions and significance of the book are presented and important terminological concepts relevant to this study are defined.

Chapter Two sets out the L2 acquisition framework adopted in the study. Four different SLA approaches that have been used to investigate L2 word order acquisition are examined. They are the Universal Grammar approach, the Processability Theory approach, the Competition Model approach and the Cognitive Functionalist Approach. The four approaches are compared and evaluated, with the Cognitive Functionalist Approach deemed as the most appropriate theoretical framework for investigating Chinese L2 word order errors.

Chapter Three, in search of existing word order error taxonomies, firstly reviews particular studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition. It then reviews studies on Chinese L2 word order errors. Through the two reviews, the need for a systematic examination of Chinese word order principles is identified. Consequently, Chinese word order principles are reviewed systematically and demonstrated with examples. Two conclusions emerge from reviewing the literature: (1) existing taxonomies are too limited for describing Chinese L2 word order errors; and (2) violation of any basic word order principle or sub-principle can be utilized as a criterion to categorize word order errors made by Chinese L2 learners.

Chapter Four explains how data should be collected and analysed in order to address the research questions. It argues for the choice of a

cross-sectional research design in the study. The main research method used is Error Analysis (EA). EA is critically reviewed and ways are presented for overcoming the limitations in methodology employed in previous Chinese EA studies, namely lack of empirical data; lack of explicit criteria in identifying errors; lack of precision in error description and lack of adequacy in error explanation.

Chapter Five presents the procedure of data collection and analysis employed in this book. Details of the participants, data type and unit of analysis are reported.

Chapter Six documents the development of a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. An existing extendable taxonomy, Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy, is applied to the data collected in order to further demonstrate its limitedness in describing Chinese L2 word order errors. Building on the categories of word order errors identified in Chapter Three, a new categorization of the Chinese L2 word order errors collected is conducted. Through this re-categorization, existing categories from the literature and new word order error categories emerging from the data are successfully incorporated into one system. Thus, a new comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors is developed. This taxonomy enables a more accurate description and specific explanation of Chinese L2 word order errors.

Chapter Seven documents the relative frequencies of occurrence of the Chinese L2 word order errors collected. It provides a quantitative perspective on Chinese L2 word order errors by showing how errors distribute among the various categories in the new taxonomy. Error rates for all word order error categories are presented and the word order error rate for each of the categories is discussed.

Chapter Eight concludes the book by revisiting the research objectives, summarizing the main findings and contributions, discussing the limitations, pinpointing pedagogical implications and suggesting topics for further research.

9. Terminology issues in this study

Before concluding this chapter, this section defines the basic terminology used in this book. This research project examines the acquisition of word order in Chinese as a foreign language. It draws on basic concepts and methods used in second language acquisition (SLA) research. However, as is common in many fields, SLA researchers often use the same

term to refer to different things. Therefore, it is necessary to define terms that will frequently appear in the upcoming chapters of this book.

9.1. The first language / mother tongue / native language (NL) and L1

The *first language* (L1) is the language a person learns first after birth. Usually a child learns the basics of her/his first language from family members or carers. This language is also referred to as her/his *mother tongue* or *native language* (NL). Very often the three terms refer to the same language; for example, to many Chinese people, Chinese is their first language, mother tongue and native language. The three terms can refer to different languages, but such cases are rare. In special cases, for example, a person with a Chinese mother and a German father, born and educated in Australia, can have all three languages (Chinese, German and English) as his/her mother tongues and L1, and English as his/her native language because English is the media for education. In this book, the three terms, namely first language, mother tongue and native language are used interchangeably. All refer to the language a person learns first after birth and is educated with, such as English in Australia and Mandarin Chinese in China.

9.2. Second language, foreign language, target language (TL) and L2

The term *foreign language* has usually been used to refer to the teaching or learning of a non-native language outside of the country or speech community where it is commonly spoken (Freed, 1991; Stern, 1983). *Second language*, in contrast to the term *foreign language*, is applied to non-native language learning or language use that takes place within one of the speech communities where that language is traditionally used (Freed, 1991; Gass & Selinker, 2001). For example, Chinese learners of English in Australia learn English as a second language while Australian learners of Chinese in Australia learn Chinese as a foreign language.

However, as Freed (1991) states, "This distinction has served to mislead some, satisfy others, and confuse even more" (p. 5). It is convenient that L2 is adopted to cover both second and foreign language. In Sharwood-Smith's (1994) words, "an L2 means, unless otherwise specified, a particular 'non-native language under discussion' " (p. 7). An L2 is also frequently referred to as a *target language* (TL). In the

coming chapters, TL and L2 are used interchangeably to refer to both second language and foreign language.

The distinction between second and foreign language learning is very important in terms of the environment where the learning occurs because there can be radical differences in both the content and methods of language learning. On the other hand, Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is the common term used for the field of research on learning a non-native language. It refers to the learning of another language after the native language has been learned. Therefore, SLA is a superordinate term to cover both *second* and *foreign* language acquisition in this book.

9.3. Acquisition versus learning

According to Krashen (1982), *acquisition* is "a process similar, if not identical, to the way children develop ability in their first language" (p. 16), which is a subconscious process. Other ways of describing acquisition include implicit learning, informal learning and natural learning. *Learning* is referred to as "conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them" (Krashen, 1982, p. 16), which is usually an explicit, formal and instructed way of developing language competence. However, many researchers do not approve of the distinction. For example, Ellis (1994) declares: "Although such a distinction can have strong face validity – particularly for teachers – it is problematic, not least because of the difficulty of demonstrating whether the knowledge learners possess is of the 'acquired' or 'learnt' kind" (p. 14). It is generally believed that adult L2 learners both 'learn' and 'acquire' in their L2 development. In this book the two terms are used interchangeably.

It is also worth noting that acquisition itself can mean several different things: "Researchers disagree about what kind of performance they think provides the best evidence of acquisition" (Ellis, 1994, p. 14). Some researchers work with productive data, some study learners' intuitions about their L2, while others study learners' accurate use of certain lexical items. Also, some researchers consider a feature has been acquired when it appears for the first time, while others require a learner to use it to some predetermined criterion-based level of accuracy, usually 90 per cent (Ellis, 1994). Although the focus of this book is not on 'acquisition', the structures are not considered as being acquired when

word order errors frequently occur or increase from lower to higher proficiency levels.

9.4. Competence versus performance

A distinction is often made between linguistic *competence* and *performance* when studying language acquisition. According to Chomsky (1965), *competence* consists of the mental representations of linguistic rules that constitute the speaker-hearer's internal grammar. Language is seen as an autonomous system and *competence* is a speaker's knowledge of that autonomous system or speaker's mental grammar, which is implicit rather than explicit. *Performance* consists of the use of this grammar in the comprehension and production of language. Language performance is seen as a form of human behaviour. The distinction between competence and performance is between what people *know* versus what they *do*. The study of learners' competence is often conducted through investigating their performance, as Ellis (1994) states:

> The main goal of SLA research is to characterize learners' underlying knowledge of the L2, i.e. to describe and explain their competence. However, learners' mental knowledge is not open to direct inspection; it can only be inferred by examining samples of their performance. SLA researchers have used different kinds of performance to try to investigate competence (p. 13).

The goal of this book is to examine learners' performance in using Chinese word order through the analysis of their written production data.

9.5. Positive transfer, negative transfer and cross-linguistic influence

Views about language transfer have undergone considerable change. Initially, transfer was understood within a behaviourist framework of learning. It was assumed that the 'habits' of the L1 would be carried over into the L2. In cases where the target language differed from the L1 this would result in *interference* or *negative transfer*. In cases where the patterns of the L1 and the L2 were similar, *positive transfer* would occur. Thus, the L1 could both impede and facilitate the acquisition of L2. Later on, the results of error analysis studies (e.g. Dulay & Burt, 1974a, 1974b) cast doubts on the validity of these claims. Now, it is generally acknowledged that transfer works in complex ways and that it

constitutes only one of several processes involved in L2 acquisition (Gass, 1996).

Odlin (1989) defines transfer as "the influence resulting from the similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired" (p. 27). The "influence" can be positive or negative. Similarly, Ellis (1994) defines L1 transfer as "the incorporation of features of the L1 into the knowledge systems of the L2 that the learner is trying to build" (p. 28). Gass (1996) defines transfer as "the use of the native language (or other language) information in the acquisition of an L2 (or additional language)" (p. 231). All these authors maintain that L1 transfer can be positive in facilitating L2 acquisition and it also can be negative in causing L2 errors.

Although language transfer sometimes is associated with behaviourism, this term is still widely used by L2 researchers and teachers. Other researchers (e.g. Odlin, 1989) use *cross-linguistic influence* to cover all kinds of language transfer or avoidance of transfer. In this study, language transfer or L1 transfer refers to both *positive* and *negative* transfer. Positive transfer refers to the facilitative role of L1 in L2 acquisition. Negative transfer refers to the misuse of L1 information in L2 acquisition.

9.6. Input versus intake

Sharwood-Smith (1994) defines *input* as "the language data (utterances, texts) which the learner is exposed to: that is, the learner's experience of the target language in all its various manifestations" (p. 8) and *intake* as "That part of input which has actually been processed by the learner and turned into knowledge of some kind" (p. 8). Following Sharwood-Smith, in this book, *input* denotes the potentially processable language data available to a learner and *intake* denotes the part of input processed by the learner.

9.7. Interlanguage

The term "interlanguage" was coined by Selinker in 1969 to refer to the interim grammars constructed by L2 learners on their way to the target language. However, the concept of interlanguage was first referred to by Pit Corder in 1967 in an article entitled "*The Significance of Learners'*

Errors", where he called it a learner's "*built-in syllabus*" or "*transitional competence*" (Corder, 1981, pp. 9–10). It was also independently termed "approximative system" by William Nemser in 1971 (cited in Nemser, 1974, p. 55). Selinker's term 'interlanguage' has gained the widest use among SLA theorists and researchers since the 1970s, and is defined as "a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL norm" (Selinker, 1974, p. 35).

According to Machida (1995), interlanguage actually refers to learner language from the learners' perspective. In her words, "With the invention of the term [interlanguage] learner language is given a status equal to first language (L1) and target language (TL)" (p. 36). So, in this book, *Interlanguage* and *learner language* are used interchangeably to refer to learners' L2 as a dynamically, systematically and ongoing developing language.

9.8. L2 errors

The publication of Pit Corder's (1967) article "*The Significance of Learners' Errors*", mentioned above, changed the conceptualization of L2 errors, which used to be seen as something to be eradicated. Now L2 errors are considered significant in the learners' learning process. Producing errors need not be seen as necessarily problematic, in fact, some errors can be evidence of a more advanced linguistic system than the equivalent correct form (Myles, Mitchell & Hooper, 1998). Myles et al. maintain that English L2 learners follow a 'U shape of learning'. For example, in learning the past tense of the verb 'take', learners start with the correct rote-learned form *took*, before over-applying the past tense rule 'ed' and producing *taked*. Later on they learn that there are exceptions to the rule and produce *took* again, creatively rather than rote-learned. The error "*taked*", thus, is an indicator of language development of the learner from a chunk-based rote-learning stage to the more advanced stage of rule application albeit mis-applied.

This book follows Lennon's (1991) definition of an L2 error as "a linguistic form... which, in the same context ... would in all likelihood not be produced by the learner's native speaker counterparts" (p. 182). More specifically, Chinese L2 word order errors refer to those linguistic forms that are either grammatically incorrect or semantically inappropriate in context in terms of word order used.

Chapter Two: Review of the literature (1) Theoretical approaches to L2 word order acquisition research

One of the most important goals of SLA research is the description and explanation of learner language (Ellis, 1994). This project aims to provide a better understanding of Chinese L2 word order acquisition by finding ways to clearly describe and specifically explain Chinese L2 word order errors in a pedagogical sense, as discussed earlier in Chapter One. An adequate theoretical framework is crucial for the description and explanation of word order errors. As Corder (1981) argues:

> Description of errors is a linguistic operation. Errors are described by the application of linguistic theory to the data of erroneous utterances produced by a learner or a group of learners. The more adequate the linguistic theory the better will be the linguistic description of errors" (p. 36).

This chapter reviews four theoretical approaches that have been employed in SLA research to investigate L2 word order acquisition, so as to determine the most adequate theoretical framework for the description and explanation of Chinese L2 word order errors. The four approaches are: the Universal Grammar (UG) approach, the Processability Theory approach, the Competition Model approach, and the Cognitive Functionalist approach. In the review of each of the first three approaches, the following five questions will be addressed: (1) what are the theoretical foundations of this approach? (2) what assumptions are made within the approach? (3) how does this approach investigate L2 word order acquisition? (4) what has been achieved? (5) how adequate is it for the task at hand? In the review of the Cognitive Functionalist approach, two sub-sections are included. The first sub-section reviews the development of this approach. The second sub-section reviews the three core areas of Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, which provides a rationale guiding the research presented in this book.

1. The UG approach: word order as a value in parameter setting

1.1. The theoretical foundations

The Universal Grammar (UG) approach claims that humans are innately endowed with universal language-specific knowledge, which Chomsky calls UG. The main argument, often referred to as the 'logical problem' of language acquisition (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991), is that without such an endowment of UG, language learning (originally referring to first language learning) would be impossible because available input is insufficiently 'rich' to allow for acquisition to occur so "rapidly", "effortlessly" and "uniformly" with such "remarkable success" (Towell & Hawkins, 1994, p. 58). Therefore, as stated in Gregg (1996), UG is proposed as a potential answer to the question why children can develop their full language competence within a comparatively short time:

> The problem is to explain how one comes to have the complex linguistic knowledge, or competence, one does, given the limited input one receives in the course of acquisition. This is a problem because the input vastly underdetermines the finally achieved competence (p. 50).

According to Chomsky's (1981) Government and Binding Theory (GB), UG is considered to consist of an abstract set of principles and parameters that serve to define the core aspects of all natural languages. Principles are non-variant rules that account for universal linguistic structures, and parameters describe values that are set differently for individual languages when a particular language learner is exposed to the language. In other words, parameter setting is triggered by linguistic input. For example, pronoun dropping (pro-drop) is one of the parameters in natural languages. This parameter has two values: pro-drop (a positive value) and non-pro-drop (a negative value) (Liceras, 1989). In a pro-drop language, its grammar permits the omission of pronouns, such as a subject pronoun, when they are pragmatically inferable. In a non-pro-drop language, its grammar does not permit the omission of pronouns (White, 1996). Chinese manifests a positive value while English manifests a negative value (Braidi, 1999). Children who are exposed to Chinese will acquire the positive value of the pro-drop parameter, which includes a cluster of features in the language, such as null subject and subject-verb inversion in declarative sentences. Children

who are exposed to English will acquire the negative value of this parameter, in which null subject and subject-verb inversion in declarative sentences are grammatically incorrect.

In L1 acquisition research it is not considered controversial that UG constitutes the innate knowledge of language and is responsible for the acquisition of language in interaction with the linguistic environment (Cook, 1993). There is wide acceptance for the position that human beings are endowed with UG, which uniformly permits children to attain full competence in their first language without explicit instruction or systematic error correction and without exposure to the full range of grammatical possibilities (see Bley-Vroman, 1989; Clahsen & Muysken, 1989; Epstein, Flynn & Martohardjono, 1996; Felix, 1988; Flynn, 1988; Schachter, 1989; White, 1988, 1996; among others). However, there remains an ongoing debate in relation to whether or not L2 learners, especially adult L2 learners, have access to UG (White, 1996). That is to say, SLA researchers have not reached agreement as to whether parameters can be reset in L2 acquisition.

Whether or not UG constrains L2 acquisition as it does L1 acquisition is a crucial question for linguists in the SLA field. Epstein et al. (1996) have made a special effort to answer this question. They argue:

> Three logical possibilities have been articulated regarding the role of UG in L2 acquisition: The first is the "no access" hypothesis that claims that no aspect of UG is available to the L2 learner. The second is the "partial access" hypothesis that claims that only L1 instantiated principles and L1 instantiated parameter-values of UG are available to the learner. The third, called the "full access" hypothesis, asserts that UG in its entirety constrains L2 acquisition (p. 677).

For Epstein et al. (1996), the third possibility, the *full access hypothesis*, is the most likely. However, their work triggered thirty-two counter commentaries following publication and most maintain that the *full access hypothesis* is problematic. According to Freidlin (1996), this approach fails to address:

> the most salient difference between language acquisition by child and adult, namely, that children acquire a language apparently flawlessly and without conscious effort, in contrast to adults who, if they acquire a second language at all, do so only imperfectly in spite of (or maybe because of) considerable conscious effort (p. 725).

The present author shares the view of scholars who propose that L2 learners do not have direct access to UG as L1 learners do, due to the

lack of uniform success in acquiring native speaker competence (Long, 1990a, 1990b), the possibility of fossilization (Clahsen, 1984) and the facilitative potential of form-focused instruction (Long, 1991, 1996).

More researchers believe that children's L1 acquisition starts with UG while adults' L2 acquisition starts with their L1. As Newmeyer (1996) states, given "the everyday English meanings of the words 'available' and 'access', this assertion [full access] is simply not correct. UG may be there, but a host of mechanisms block available access to it for the normal adult" (p. 736). The difference between children's L1 and adults' L2 acquisition lies in the fact that children's L1 acquisition is essential for the development of cognition while adults' L2 learning is not. This should account for the guaranteed success of the former and general failure of the latter. Their starting point is different: children start L1 acquisition with the most basic cognitive ability while adults start L2 acquisition with highly developed cognition. Children develop their L1 and cognition together while adults learn their L2 hand in hand with their L1. Indeed, adults cannot avoid using their L1 while learning their L2 (Jiang, 2004).

1.2. Theoretical assumptions

Researchers investigating L2 acquisition within the UG framework generally either hold the "partial access" hypothesis that claims that only L1 instantiated principles and L1 instantiated parameter-values of UG are available to the L2 learner (i.e. Schachter, 1989; Strozer, 1994), or the "full access" hypothesis that asserts that UG in its entirety constrains L2 acquisition (i.e. Epstein et al., 1996; Flynn, 1988, 1996; White, 1996). The former generally assume that L2 learners start with their L1 parameter setting and with sufficient L2 input, learners, at a certain stage, reset their parameter according to the parameter-value of the TL. The latter assume that L2 learners have access to UG at the very beginning of L2 acquisition.

1.3. Investigating L2 word order acquisition

The main data collecting method in UG-oriented L2 acquisition studies to date is the grammaticality judgment task (Ellis, 1994). It involves the learner making some kind of metalingual assessment regarding the grammaticality of a mixed set of sentences, some grammatically correct

and some grammatically incorrect. The assumption is that when the task forces learners to consider sentences that are 'impossible' from a UG standpoint, rejecting such sentences indicates the existence of UG while accepting them indicates non-existence of UG.

Research into the accessibility of UG parameters that are relevant to L2 word order acquisition has centered on two parameters: pro-drop and verb movement. Each of the parameters is briefly discussed below.

The first parameter, the pro-drop parameter, is often referred to as the null subject parameter, which divides languages into pro-drop languages in which the subject of the sentence may be left out, as in Italian *Sono di Torino* 'am from Turin' and Chinese *shuo* 'speak', and non-pro-drop languages in which the subject must be present in the actual sentence, as in English, German, and French (Chomsky, 1981, Braidi, 1999). Languages that allow pro-drop are said to exhibit uniform verbal inflectional paradigms (the Morphological Uniformity Principle of Jaeggli and Safir, 1989, in Braidi, 1999). That is, a morphologically uniform language has either all verb forms inflected for person and number, as in Italian and Spanish, or only one form for all persons and numbers, as in Chinese. In any 'mixed' language, in which verbs sometimes change forms and sometimes do not, as found in English (I, you, we, you, they *do*; and he, she, it *does*), pro-drop will not be allowed (Braidi, 1999). The reason for this division may be because, in a morphologically uniform language, the identity of the dropped subject or zero pronoun can possibly be recovered, either by 'rich' morphological marking as in Spanish, where the subject can be determined by the verb form, or by a topic involved, as in languages like Chinese. The following example (9) is adapted from Huang (1984).

(9a) 张三　　看见　李四 了 吗?
Zhangsan kanjian Lisi le ma?
Zhangsan see *Lisi* LE
Did *Zhangsan* see *Lisi*?

(9b) 看见　他 了。
Kanjian ta le.
See him LE
[*Zhangsan*] saw him.

The topic in the above sentences is *Zhangsan*, so the dropped subject in (9b) is *Zhangsan*, not *Lisi*.

In sum, in order to exhibit a positive value in the pro-drop parameter setting, a language must both license pro-drop by morphological uniformity and by ways of identifying the dropped subject pronoun. Chinese is a pro-drop language because it presents its morphological uniformity by using a single form of verb for any person or number. The topic involved provides information for the recovering of a dropped subject.

The second parameter relevant to word order is called verb movement parameter. This parameter accounts for language variation in the word order of verbs, adverbs, verbal complements, and negation as a result of syntactic movements governed by verb movement rules (Braidi, 1999). White (1991a) studied adverb placement in French and English and found that, while placement in sentence-final and sentence-initial positions is grammatical in both French and English, the permitted sentence-internal word order between the verb and the adverb clearly differ in the two languages. French allows the adverb to occur between the verb and its object, hence subject-verb-adverb-object (SVAO) order, and prohibits the adverb from occurring between subject and the verb, namely, subject-adverb-verb (SAV) order; English has the opposite word-order configurations, namely, it allows SAV order, but prohibits SVAO order.

According to the "movement rule hypothesis", one word order can result from another through movement transformation (Li & Thompson, 1985, p. 517). For example, the question '*Is he a teacher?*' is transformed from the statement '*He is a teacher*' by moving "is" to the initial position. However, not all languages have verb movement or syntactic movement (Cook, 1993). In Cook's words:

> One of the major variations between human languages is whether indeed they have or do not have syntactic movement, that is to say whether they need the two levels of s-structure [surface-structure] and d-structure [deep-structure] for describing syntax or require only one. Languages such as Japanese and Chinese, for example, form questions by adding a question word within the sentence without movement. . . . it is hard to see how the main aspects of the model can have anything to say about the L2 learning of languages that have *no* syntactic movement, such as Japanese, and little to say about those with variable movement, such as Turkish (p. 105).

The legitimacy of Cook's criticism is obvious. The reliance on syntactic movement makes it unclear just how this approach is to apply to languages without movement. Li and Thompson (1985) provide strong evidence against a movement rule hypothesis in Chinese. They argue that

one word order is not the result of another word order through movement in Chinese. They state "Each of the various word order possibilities in such a language [Chinese] corresponds to a particular discourse-related meaning, and these correlations are simply learned by the speaker of the language" (p. 518). If this is the case, the verb movement parameter is not applicable in accounting for Chinese word order. Alternative explanations must be sought to address the positions of verbs and adverbs in Chinese sentences.

1.4. Achievements

Clahsen and Muysken (1986, 1989) have compared L1 and L2 acquisition of German word order involving verb placement, verb inflection, and verb negation, and they have concluded that, while L1 acquisition is guided by UG, L2 learners do not have direct access to UG.

Hulk (1991) investigated the acquisition of word order properties in French L2 by Dutch native speakers within the UG framework. His hypothesis was that L2 learners initially adopt L1 parameter settings in their L2 word order acquisition and at certain points in their linguistic development they reset the values of these parameters to the setting required by L2. The three parameters investigated in Hulk's (1991) study were the head parameter, the verb movement parameter, and the topicalization parameter. These three parameters have different values in Dutch (L1) and French (L2). For example, for the head parameter, Dutch is head final and has basic object-verb (OV) word order while French is head initial and has basic verb-object (VO) word order.

The data collected were from four groups of French L2 learners at four different proficiency levels using a grammaticality judgment task consisting of 40 sentences in French. Learners were required to indicate whether each of the 40 sentences was 'good' or 'bad' in French, according to their own judgment. The results were presented in the form of percentages of learners who judged the test sentence as 'good'. They were ordered in relation to the phenomena involved: (1) the position of the head; (2) verb movement; (3) topicalization (fronting).

The results showed that the Dutch L1 speakers clearly started out with SOVI ('I' for INFL, which means head final here), a typical Dutch word order, in their first stage of French L2 acquisition. They easily reset the head parameter in their second stage, then reset the verb movement parameter, but had considerable difficulty in resetting the topicali-

zation parameter, which is "contrary to what is found in German L2 acquisition" (Hulk, 1991, p. 30).

Hertel (2003) has investigated the acquisition of Spanish L2 word order by native speakers of English. He considered the lexical and discourse factors in determining the word order of intransitive sentences, specifically subject-verb (SV) versus verb-subject (VS) in Spanish L2 word order acquisition. Participants included a native speaker control group and learners at four proficiency levels. Results from a contextualized production task indicate that beginning learners transferred the SV order of English for all structures. Intermediate learners showed a gradual increase in the production of lexically and discourse-determined inversion (VS), although their data was also characterized by indeterminacy and variability. The advanced learners demonstrated sensitivity to the word order effects of unaccusativity and discourse factors, but also tended to overgeneralize inversion in neutral discourse context.

In sum, one prediction from a parameter-setting model is that, if UG is accessible and parameters can be reset, all of the structures constrained by a parameter should be in evidence once the parameter is reset. However, the L2 research discussed above shows that this is not the case for the earlier formulation of the pro-drop parameter nor for the verb movement parameter. As Braidi (1999) states, "The reasons suggested for these results are that the parameter has not been reset or that the analysis of the parameter is incorrect" (p. 75).

1.5. Adequacy for understanding L2 word order errors

As evident from the above discussion, the UG approach is a highly abstract theoretical approach. It is considered to be inadequate for guiding this research project for the following reasons.

Firstly, whether L2 learners have access to UG is still controversial. Many researchers hold the "no access" or "partial access" positions. The article "Second language acquisition: Theoretical and experimental issues in contemporary research" by Epstein et al. (1996) that argues for a "full access" position immediately triggered thirty-two voices strongly against this view. All thirty-two authors (e.g. Bley-Vroman, 1996; Borer, 1996; Clahsen & Muysken, 1996) argue that L2 acquisition is fundamentally different from L1 acquisition in terms of learners' ultimate language attainment, variation in success and indeterminate intuitions about the grammaticality of sentences, among other factors.

Secondly, there is the problem that linguists who work on the UG theory keep on coming with new ideas and new theoretical propositions. In many ways this is laudable and a sign of the vitality of the field. The problem is that while researchers working within UG may be content with this state of affairs, 'consumers' who are interested not in developments in linguistic theory for their own sake, but instead in the explanatory value the account can provide in related areas, find themselves stranded when the version of the theory they are testing is abandoned by UG researchers themselves. For example, UG theory is focused on the rule system of surface structure (s-structure) and deep structure (d-structure) in the 60s and 70s, on the principles and parameters in the 80s, and on minimalist program after the 90s. Given this state of affairs, the attractions of the approach wane considerably (Braidi, 1999; Skehan, 1998).

Thirdly, as Schachter (1996) notes, many important issues in SLA do not receive high priority in UG studies. For example, the UG approach does not address how errors occur, how learners acquire lexicon, how they construct form-meaning networks and how they learn to perform speech acts appropriately, among other things. Similarly, methods of eliciting competence-oriented language seem a long way away from the concepts of proficiency that language teachers and L2 researchers take for granted. As a result, there is a kind of remoteness about UG studies as far as ongoing second language development is concerned and a lack of external validity which, quite apart from the experimental evidence, undermines the relevance and significance of the UG-based account (Skehan, 1998).

Fourthly, the methodological problems of UG-based studies lie in the over-reliance on grammaticality judgment tests, the relative lack of longitudinal studies and the indeterminacy of acquisition due to UG-based and general cognitive learning (Ellis, 1994). For example, as an intuitional data collection method, the grammaticality judgment test remains a controversial method (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Birdsong (1989) points out that the grammaticality judgment test is not appropriate for learners with poor L2 literacy, and that differences in the metalinguistic skills of literate learners are also likely to affect responses. Ellis (1994) also points out that when learners reject sentences, it is not always clear whether this is because of their grammatical properties or because of the difficulties that they experience in trying to parse them.

In discussing acquisition of L2 word order, the UG approach is primarily concerned with the examination of whether the parameters can

be reset in L2. Since languages differ in their setting values of a given UG parameter, learners' L2 performance may manifest L1 rather than L2 value if the resetting in L2 is lacking. So, UG provides potential account for L2 word order errors theoretically. However, this approach neither describes various word order structures nor provides specific pedagogical explanation for various word order errors. Therefore, UG is not adequate to guide the present research project. Alternatives need to be explored. Two influential approaches that examine the role of processing in L2 word order acquisition, Processability Theory and the Competition Model, are reviewed below.

2. Processability Theory: word order as a processing-constrained sequence

2.1. Theoretical foundations

Pienemann's (1998) Processability Theory (PT) treats language acquisition as a cognitive process by identifying mental states of the learner in terms of their causal interactions with other mental states. PT "formally predicts which structures can be processed by the learner at a given level of development" (Pienemann, 1998, p. xv). Specifically, Pienemann (1998) argues that the acquisition of language includes two processes: one is the acquisition of linguistic knowledge and the other is the acquisition of language processing procedures to process the knowledge. He further argues that the acquisition of language processing procedures follows an implicational sequence, which forms a processing hierarchy. Simply put, according to Pienemann (1998), a *word* needs to be added to the target language lexicon before its grammatical category can be assigned. After its grammatical *category* is established, a *phrasal* procedure is required to see what type of phrase it forms and what function the phrase can play, such as being a subject or object of a sentence. Subsequent to this, the phrase can be arranged into a *sentence*. The last procedure in the hierarchy deals with the ways of *joining sentences* together. This sequence follows an implicational pattern in which each procedure is a necessary prerequisite for the following procedure. In sum, PT is a cognitive theory that incorporates the concept of interlanguage as developing systems by focusing on the processing prerequisites that are necessary for the production of linguistic structures. The language acquisition

process is understood as the gradual acquisition of mechanisms for the processing of linguistic information.

2.2. Theoretical assumptions

In PT, exchange of grammatical information between the constituents of a structure is a key aspect of language processing because the complexity of procedural skills is defined by the extent of information exchange between grammatical constituents of a structure (e.g. subject-verb agreement, plural and/or gender agreement within NP) (Pienemann, 1998). According to this theory, L2 processing procedures are developed in increments, starting from psycholinguistically less complex one(s). Based on this general principle, a hierarchy of five developmental stages in SLA has emerged (Pienemann, 1998, p. 79):

Stage 1. Word access/Lemma: This is the beginning stage of L2 development, which is the simplest procedure. As such, only invariant forms such as individual words and phrases, and formulaic expressions are produced because they directly map the underlying meaning and do not involve any information exchange between constituents.

Stage 2. Category Procedure: The Category Procedure enables the L2 words to be assigned a grammatical category (N, V, A, etc.). Once this is achieved, lexical morphemes can be produced. Lexical morphemes are those bound forms which do not exchange information with any other constituents in a given structure. For example, the English past tense marker *–ed* is processed by this procedure.

Stage 3. Phrasal Procedure: At this stage, phrases are formed. Grammatical affixes that require information exchange within a phrase can be produced. For example, in an English NP *three girls*, the lemma GIRLS contains the diacritic feature of PLURAL, which matches THREE.

Stage 4. S-procedure: At this stage, information exchange occurs across phrasal boundaries. Subject-Verb agreement is a case in point. Phrases are also assigned a grammatical function, such as subject or object. For example, if the English NP *a dog* is a subject, the verb that follows must be *third person* and *singular* as in *A dog likes bones*.

Stage 5. Sub-clause Procedure: This stage is characterized by the occurrence of complex sentence structures: e.g. embedded clauses and subordinate clauses. In this processing procedure, information exchange also occurs across clausal boundaries.

Based on the above processing procedures, Pienemann (1998) predicts that the beginning learner is unable to produce any structures which rely on the exchange of specific L2 grammatical information using syntactic procedures. He further predicts that "structures involving no exchange of grammatical information between constituents can be processed before structures that do require such information exchanges" (p. 76) and that structures that have more processing complexity will be acquired later than those that have less. In terms of word order, canonical word order will be processed first, and then constituents at sentence initial and final positions, which are considered to be salient positions, are processed before constituents that are positioned in the middle of a sentence, due to the perceptual salience principle (Pienemann, 1998).

2.3. Investigating L2 word order acquisition

Both Meisel, Clahsen and Pienemann (1981) and Pienemann (1998) employed the "emergence criterion" in identifying the point at which a word order pattern makes its first systematic and productive appearance in German L2. Describing the rationale behind the emergence criterion, Pienemann (1998, p. 138) states:

> From a speech processing point of view, emergence can be understood as the point in time at which certain skills have, in principle, been attained or at which certain operations can, in principle, be carried out. From a descriptive viewpoint one can say that this is the beginning of an acquisition process, and focusing on the start of this process will allow the researcher to reveal more about the rest of the process.

Through this emergence criterion, several stages that concern the acquisitional sequence of German L2 word order rules were identified (Clahsen, 1980; Meisel et al., 1981; Pienemann, 1998).

In order to better understand the developmental sequence of German L2 word order rules, it is necessary to review these word order rules, which Cook (1993) depicts as follows:

> The usual order in declarative main clauses is Subject-Verb-Object (SVO), for example, "Ich liebe dich" (I love you). But non-finite verb forms (that is, not inflected for number and person), such as participles, must occur at the end of main clauses as in "Ich habe dich geliebt", Subject-Auxiliary-Object-Verb (I have you loved); this is called the *Verb Separation Rule*. The finite verb (that is

> inflected for number and person) and auxiliary also come in the second position in main clauses after certain forms such as adverbs, question words, or topicalized NPs, as in "Immer liebe ich dich", Adverb-Verb-Subject-Object (Always love I you); this called the *Inversion rule*, which in addition presupposes an *Adverb Preposing rule* that takes the adverb to the beginning. Subordinate clauses have the order SOV rather than SVO as in "Ich sagte dass ich dich liebte" Subject-Verb-[Complementiser-Subject-Object-Verb] (I said that I you loved); this is the *Verb Final rule* (pp. 93–94).

These German word order rules were found to be acquired in the same sequential stages by L2 learners with different L1 backgrounds, such as Italian and Spanish (Clahsen, 1980; Meisel et al., 1981; Pienemann, 1998). The basic sequence of acquisition can be summarized as follows (Pienemann, 1998, p. 45):

Stage x = Canonical Order
die kinder spielen mim ball (Concetta)
'the children play with the ball'

Stage x + 1 = Adverb Preposing (ADV)
de kinder spielen (Concetta)
'there children play'

Stage x + 2 = Verb Separation (SEP)
alle kinder muß die pause machen (Concetta)
'all children must the break have'

Stage x + 3 = INVERSION (INV)
dann hat sie wieder die knoch gebringt (Eva)
'then has she again the bone bringed'

Stage x + 4 = Verb Final (V-END)
er sagt, daß er nach hause kommt
'he said that he home comes'

The above acquisitional sequence of German L2 word order is largely based on the results of the ZISA project[4] of Meisel et al. (1981) and related studies. Learners started out using a canonical SVO order. In a second stage, they used adverbs in a topicalized position, however without respecting subject inversion. In the third stage of the develop-

4. ZISA stands for "Zweitspracherwerb Italienischer (Portugiesischer) und Spanischer Arbeiter" in German, which means "Second Language Acquisition of Italian (Portuguese) and Spanish Workers".

mental sequence, verbal material was separated (separate verbs, perfect, modals). Having achieved this step, learners started to invert correctly. Mastering of previous structures enabled subjects to apply final verbs in embedded sentences. These findings led to the emergence of a theoretical approach in SLA, known as the Multidimensional Model, which attempts to account for both a similar acquisition order across L2 learners as well as individual variation among learners.

Clahsen (1984) explains the above developmental stages by relating learners' degree of processing capacity to three processing strategies: the Canonical Order Strategy (COS), the Initialization/Finalization Strategy (IFS), and the Subordinate Clause Strategy (SCS). Each processing strategy represents a different level of processing complexity. The COS, which prohibits any movement, represents the most restrictive strategy. The IFS only allows for permutation at salient positions while SCS restricts permutations in embedded clauses.

Pienemann (1998) reconsiders these strategies in the perspective of Processability Theory and defines the complexity of procedural skills by the extent of information exchange between grammatical constituents of a structure. In this regard, Processability Theory has extended the scope of the predictive and explanatory coverage to areas of both syntax and morphology while the strategies approach was restricted to word order alone. For German word order rules, Processability Theory predicts the following hierarchy (Braidi, 1999, p. 129):

6 main and subordinate clauses	6 V to End
5 inter-phrasal information exchange / −saliency	5 Inversion
4 inter-phrasal information exchange / +saliency	4 Particle Shift
3 phrasal information exchange	3 ADV Preposing
2 lexical morphemes	2 SVO
1 words	1 Word

The above hierarchy predicts that the acquisitional sequence for German L2 word order rules is from stage 1 to 6. This hierarchy is developed and theorized from the acquisitional sequence of German L2 word order (stage x to stage x + 4) (see p. 35). The acquisition of each lower level forms the prerequisite for the next higher level. In light of the predictions of this Processability Hierarchy, Pienemann and Håkansson (1996) re-evaluate the findings of 14 empirical studies of L2 acquisition of Swedish morpho-syntax (SSL). The reanalysis confirms

that the predictions of the Processability Hierarchy are consistent with the orders of acquisition demonstrated in the body of research on L2 Swedish.

2.4. Achievements

Due to the commitment of the ZISA research group and the extended development into Processability Theory by Pienemann (1998), German L2 word order acquisition research, compared with other languages, has received most attention from researchers in the SLA field. In addition, German L2 word order acquisition studies play a pioneering role in the identification of acquisition sequence in the SLA field. The original German word order studies and reanalysis of the Swedish studies demonstrate that the processability of grammatical structures may be a determining factor in the L2 developmental stages evidenced in these studies (Braidi, 1999). Moreover, the German L2 word order studies show that: (1) the acquisition content of German L2 word order is a few syntactic rules, namely, *Canonical word order, Adverb preposing, Verb separation, Inversion and Verb final*; and (2) these rules are acquired in the same sequential order as identified above by all German L2 learners, irrespective of their L1 backgrounds. This is enlightening for studies on the acquisition of L2 word order in other languages in that the research directions have been indicated. In other words, the specific acquisition contents and acquisition sequences for L2 word order in other languages can be explored.

In terms of Chinese L2 word order acquisition, although it is also important to investigate the specific acquisition content and acquisitional sequence, it remains beyond the scope of the present research project.

2.5. Adequacy for understanding L2 word order errors

The chief thread in the German L2 learner's development is the modification of canonical word order by *moving elements* within the sentence. Although Pienemann (1998) has extended the German word order rules from the syntactic movement to grammatical information exchange, the constraint for word order is still sentence-based. It is difficult to see that these rules can be applied to discourse-oriented and pragmatic word

order (PWO) languages like Chinese, where semantic and discourse factors, instead of syntactic constraints within a sentence, play more important roles in determining actual word order arrangement.

Pienemann (1998) has responded to the above queries and confirmed that "word order rules are language-specific" (p. 74). He also emphasizes that unique L2 word order rules must be acquired although the acquisition can be influenced by L1 word order rules:

> There is no guarantee that the learner will not attempt to transfer L1 word order onto L2, but it is equally likely that he or she will initially express the relationship between conceptual structures and surface form in a computationally simpler way. After all, the L1 word order rules may rely on categories with the applications which do not exist in the L2, and this would interfere with the application of L1 word order. In any case, there is no way around acquiring the unique set of word order rules for the L2 if acquisition is to progress (p. 75).

What Pienemann means is that L2 word order acquisition is not only influenced by learners' L1, but also influenced by how closely the L1 and L2 are related to each other. Although learners tend to transfer their L1 word order rules in their L2 word order acquisition, the different features between L1 and L2 can make the transfer very complicated. Nevertheless, most important for L2 word order acquisition is to acquire the unique L2 word order "rules". In relation to Chinese L2 word order acquisition, the key lies in the unique "rules" governing Chinese word order and its variations.

The emergence methodology employed in PT determines its advantage in identifying developmental stages of L2 acquisition. The structures that emerge earlier are regarded as earlier stages in L2 development. This methodology matches a longitudinal research design (for elaboration, see p. 112), which involves obtaining data from the same L2 learners from time to time. Although this approach has successfully explained the acquisitional sequences of L2 word order development in German, English and Swedish, this does not mean it can explain Chinese L2 word order development. One reason is that Chinese word order does not involve syntactic movement. Another reason is that Chinese word order is, to a great extent, pragmatically constrained. Moreover, similar to the UG approach, the PT approach does not describe various L2 word order structures, nor does it explain how L2 word order errors occur. Therefore, the PT approach is not suitable to guide the present research project.

3. The Competition Model: word order as a cue linking a form and its function

3.1. Theoretical foundations

Unlike the UG, which is a competence approach, the Competition Model (CM) is a performance approach. Similar to PT, it is a sentence-processing approach. The CM was proposed by Bates and MacWhinney (1982) and expanded in MacWhinney and Bates (1989) to account for cross-linguistic differences in sentence processing (Bates and MacWhinney, 1982, 1989; Bates et al., 1982; MacWhinney, 1987, 1997, 2001). More specifically, this approach was developed to investigate how people of a given language make use of surface cues (e.g. word order, verb agreement, noun animacy) in determining the agent-patient relation in a sentence, since it assumes that processing language data is a cue-driven process. The CM was first formulated to deal with data from adult and child L1 speakers. Over time, it has been applied successfully to account for L2 acquisition (Gass, 1987; Harrington, 1987; Kempe & MacWhinney, 1998; Kilborn, 1989; MacWhinney, 1987; Rounds & Kanagy, 1998; Sasaki, 1991, 1994) and to deal with language loss in aphasia (Bates, Friederici & Wulfeck, 1987; Smith & Mimica, 1984; Vaid & Chengappa, 1988). As a functional approach, CM holds the belief that "the forms of natural languages are created, governed, constrained, and acquired and used in the service of communicative functions" (Bates & MacWhinney, 1989, p. 3).

3.2. Theoretical assumptions

The CM assumes that language knowledge is distributed in an associated pattern in neural networks, rather than represented in symbolic form like a syntactic parser (Ellis, 1998; Kempe & MacWhinney, 1998; McClelland, Rumelhart & Hinton, 1986). In the associated patterns of networks, multiple sources of knowledge (e.g. syntactic, lexical, pragmatic and context) interact simultaneously to constrain on-line comprehension from the first stage of sentence processing (Harrington, 2001). Therefore, the processing manner is parallel, not serial, in this approach. The information flow is a two-way process, namely both bottom-up and top-down, in which lexical access and sentential context can mutually

influence one another at a very early stage (Li, 1998). In other words, sentence processing is viewed as the process of activating interconnections between units in the network, while several sources of information are concurrently activated.

A fundamental assumption of the approach is that relations between surface forms and their functions can be described in terms of *cue strength* or *cue weight* of their interaction, rather than as a set of rules (Bates & MacWhinney, 1982, 1989). Cue strength refers to the reliability of a form for marking its claimed function or functions. For example, the word order of a preverbal position marks the function of subject in English. In L2 acquisition, to acquire a form also implies the acquisition of the *cue strength/weight* between the form and its functions.

The CM approach also assumes that the mapping between surface forms (cues) and their underlying meanings (functions) occurs in a many-to-many fashion, that is, a given form maps onto several functions and a given function maps onto several forms. For instance, in Chinese, the word order of a preverbal position is often associated with the functions of grammatical topic, subject and actor (agent); on the other hand, both word order and noun animacy can mark the actor/agent role. The difference between L1 and L2 acquisition lies in that L1 learners enter the learning process with cue weights set at zero while L2 learners enter the process with initial cue weights corresponding to those of their L1 (McDonald, 1987). This difference in starting cue weights causes L1 transfer in the learning of L2. Use of the L1 cue weights in L2 sentences will cause errors in sentences containing conflicting cues that have different strengths in the two languages. According to McDonald (1987), L2 learners gradually adjust their cue weights from L1 to L2 with increasing L2 exposure and feedback from errors.

3.3. Investigating L2 word order acquisition

This approach proposes that language processing is a cue-driven process. The different cues can converge or compete in determining meaning in sentence processing. For example, noun animacy (a semantic cue) and word order (a syntactic cue) are two cues to indicate agent-patient relations in simple declarative sentences. In the English sentence *The girl chases the kite*, noun animacy and word order converge to indicate *the girl* as the agent of the sentence. However, in the sentence *The*

stone hits the boy, the word order cue promotes *the stone* as the agent, but the noun animacy cue suggests *the boy* be the agent. In this kind of situation, when two or more cues constrain interpretation in diverging directions, these cues are in competition.

Since any form in the L2 may realize a number of functions and, conversely, any one function can be realized through a number of forms, the learner's task is to discover the particular form-function mappings that characterize the target language (Ellis, 1994). Form-function mappings are characterized as being of varying cue strengths in different languages. Studies within this approach have investigated the function of 'agency', which has a number of possible formal exponents, such as word order, agreement, case marking and noun animacy.

In order to test whether L2 learners acquire these forms (e.g. word order) and the cue-strengths of their functions, researchers invariably employ a sentence interpretation task. Simple sentences with two nouns (N) and a verb (V) arranged with different word orders (NVN, NNV and VNN) are provided. In these sentences, the variables of animate and inanimate nouns, case marking of nouns and N-V agreement, among others, are often included. Participants are asked to indicate which N is the agent/subject of each sentence.

3.4. Achievements

The CM approach has been applied in L2 acquisition studies of various languages. They include L2 Chinese (Liu, Bates & Li, 1992; Su, 1998, 2001), Dutch (McDonald, 1987), English (Gass, 1987; Hernandez, Bates & Avila, 1994; Kilborn & Cooreman, 1987; Kilborn, 1989; Su, 2001), French (McDonald & Heilenman, 1991; Heilenman & McDonald, 1993), Italian (Gass, 1987), and Japanese (Harrington, 1987; Sasaki, 1991, 1994). All these studies show that *cue-strength* and processing strategies between a form and a function are language specific. L2 learners often transfer their L1 processing strategies in their L2 learning.

Previous studies on Chinese and English sentence processing based on the CM approach (e.g. Bates & MacWhinney, 1989; Li, Bates & MacWhinney, 1993; Liu et al., 1992; Miao, 1981; Su, 1998, 2001) have shown that Chinese native speakers pervasively rely on semantic cue (e.g. noun animacy) to interpret agent-patient relationship of a sentence, whereas English native speakers overwhelmingly depend on syntactic

cue (e.g. word order) to determine the agent role. These studies demonstrate that word order plays different roles in determining agent-patient relationship in English and Chinese. As Li et al. (1993) conclude "the way in which word order affects processing in Chinese is different from the effects observed in English" (p. 188). More specifically, word order is more reliable in English while noun animacy is more reliable in Chinese to interpret the agent role in a sentence. In other words, for the interpretation of sentence roles, noun animacy has more cue strength in Chinese while word order has more cue strength in English. This does not mean that word order is not important in Chinese or noun animacy is not important in English. What it does indicate is that Chinese relies more on semantic properties (meaning) to arrange word order in a sentence while English relies more on word order to interpret the semantic properties of the constituents in a sentence.

Su's study (2001) has a particular focus on the transfer of L1 processing strategies in L2 learning in both English and Chinese. A total of 122 people participated in her study. They comprised two main groups: Chinese native speakers and English native speakers. In each main group, four subgroups were further divided: one native control group ($n = 16$) and three learner groups varying in their level of proficiency in the L2 (beginning, intermediate, and advanced) (each $n = 15$).

The cues that were tested in Su's (2001) study were word order and noun animacy. Word order was considered to be an English L1 agent-patient processing strategy while noun animacy was considered to be a Chinese L1 agent-patient processing strategy. The test sentences were composed of two nouns (N) and one verb (V) with the two cues present in converging or competing combinations. There were three different word order types: verb medial (NVN), verb initial (VNN), and verb final (NNV). Animacy was varied on three levels: the two nouns were (1) animate-animate (AA), (2) animate-inanimate (AI), or (3) inanimate-animate (IA). All possible combinations resulted in nine sentence types: AVA, AAV, VAA; AVI, AIV, VAI; IVA, IAV, VIA.

Su's (2001) data presents four different transfer patterns of word order and noun animacy cue weights:

1. Learners use their L1 strategies in processing the L2 (forward transfer).
2. Learners apply their new L2 strategies in processing the L1 (backward transfer).

3. Learners merge the two sets of cue hierarchies used by monolinguals and use the combined strategies in processing L1 and L2 (amalgamation).
4. Learners use separate strategies for each language: that is, they perform like monolinguals in their L1 and L2 (differentiation).

While the significance of the four transfer patterns is beyond the scope of the present study, the finding that is most relevant to the project at hand is: "There was clear evidence that the CFL learners transferred English strategies in interpreting Chinese sentences, regardless of their proficiency levels" (2001, p. 102).

Given that native-English-speaking learners of Chinese rely more on word order in their NL (English) to interpret the agent role of a sentence, they would tend to transfer the same strategy in processing their TL (Chinese). However, in Chinese, word order arrangement is dependent on its meaning. Word order is flexible in the sense that different arrangements of the same constituents due to different meanings intended are always possible. In other words, CFL learners tend to rely on something (word order) that may not be reliable after all since it varies according to different meanings. This, in a sense, may account for why CFL learners often produce sentences with word order errors in their TL (Chinese) performance. Different cue-strength of word order in English and Chinese can, at least partially, account for the challenge that the native English-speaking learners face in learning Chinese L2 word order.

3.5. Adequacy for understanding L2 word order errors

The main achievement of the CM approach is that it has proven itself as a reliable means for modelling both cross-linguistic cue strengths and interlanguage development (Harrington, 2001). In particular, it has proven itself as an appropriate framework for modelling transfer in SLA research. In sentence comprehension, cues can either compete or converge to yield a particular interpretation. This process of competition and convergence has been modelled in the CM research literature in the domain of thematic role assignment, in particular in the interpretation of the sentential agent. As Ellis (1994) comments:

> The strength of the Competition Model is that it allows researchers to test very precise hypotheses. It also provides a convincing account of a number of aspects of L2 acquisition which any theory must consider: the role of the L1, the effect of input and the gradual way in which native-like ability is acquired (p. 378).

At the same time, this approach has its limitations. A major limitation of the CM approach is that its domain of application remains limited, as Harrington (2001) states that "empirical support for the model is almost exclusively drawn from a single linguistic domain" (p. 113). Up to the present, empirical studies employing the CM exclusively investigate a single linguistic domain (the assignment of the sentential agent) with simple transitive sentences. Two nouns (one animate and one inanimate) and one verb arranged in different orders are provided and participants are asked to indicate the agent or the subject of the sentence. The only cue validity tested is the one linking the function of *agent* role in a sentence and cues such as *word order*, *noun animacy*, *agreement* and *case marking*. The domain of application of the CM seems difficult to extend.

A second limitation is that the CM mainly relies on simple sentences and ungrammatical sentences (Ellis, 1994; Gibson, 1992; McLaughlin & Harrington, 1989). In reality, however, (1) sentences are much more complicated than those used in research; and (2) ungrammatical sentences are artificial. In Ellis' (1994) words, "Probably the main weakness of the model is over-reliance on rather artificial interpretation tasks, a problem that is aggravated by the unnatural sentences that figure in such tasks" (p. 378).

A third limitation lies in the fact that the CM does not address the cognitive mechanisms responsible for obtaining intake from input or for using L2 knowledge in production (Ellis, 1994). Sentence processing involves both linguistic and non-linguistic factors. As Sakai, Homae and Hashimoto (2003) maintain, "sentence processing is uniquely human", and it "closely interacts with other cognitive faculties of the mind, such as perception, memory, and consciousness" (p. 273). It has been increasingly recognized by linguists that many linguistic phenomena are controlled and motivated by non-linguistic factors. For example, Marshall and Gilmour (1993) have found that the successful comprehension of a text depends on the activation of appropriate content schemata or background knowledge. Many studies (e.g. Machida, 2001; Marshall & Gilmour, 1993; Tudor, 1989) have demonstrated that content overlap between a text and a reader's prior knowledge or content schema greatly enhances reading comprehension.

Theoretically the CM has great potential for the explanation of L2 word order errors. The different form-function mappings or cue strengths/weights between L1 and L2 are the causes of L2 errors, including L2 word order errors. However, the only cue-strength/weight in form-function mappings tested is the 'agent' role function and its various forms, such as word order and noun animacy. As a paradigm-driven approach, the application domain of the CM is rather limited at present. So, it cannot provide a theoretical framework enabling the present project to describe and explain various Chinese L2 word order errors. Only a theoretical framework that provides a valid account for the operating system of Chinese word order can be employed to guide the present study in order to attain the research goal of developing a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. The Cognitive Functionalist Approach is such a framework. This framework is reviewed in the next section.

4. The Cognitive Functionalist Approach

4.1. The development of Cognitive Functionalist Approach

The Cognitive Functionalist Approach embraces the tenets from both Cognitive Linguistics and the functionalist school of language. Cognitive Linguistics aims to provide accounts for language that mesh well with current understandings of the human mind, and is generally opposed to the more syntactocentric approaches to meaning in generative linguistics (UG). Lee (2001) explains that:

> The main feature that distinguishes Cognitive Linguistics from generative grammar has to do with the place of meaning in the theory. In the generative model the structure of linguistic expressions is deemed to be determined by a formal rule system that is largely independent of meaning. By contrast cognitivists argue that linguistic structure is a direct reflex of cognition in the sense that a particular linguistic expression is associated with particular way of conceptualizing a given situation (p. 1).

The guiding principle behind Cognitive Linguistics is that language use must be explained with reference to underlying mental processes and conceptualization of the world that apply not only to language but to many other aspects of human cognition. The most influential linguists

working along this line of research and focusing centrally on cognitive principles and language organization are Wallace Chafe (1970), Charles Fillmore (1975), George Lakoff (1970, 1987), Ronald Langacker (1987, 1999), and Leonard Talmy (2003).

The Prague School is a functionalist school of language. This school views language as consisting of two important aspects, the structural (systematic) and the functional aspects, as highlighted in the "Thèses" (Daneš, 1987). That is, on the one hand, language is systematically structured in terms of rules, and, on the other hand, the structure of language is only a means for people to fulfill communicative functions. More specifically, the functional approach takes the perspective that syntactic constraints are necessarily connected to semantic and pragmatic constraints, namely communicative functions. The central tenet of the functional approach is to emphasize linguistic structure as reflecting the role of language as a tool of human communication rather than as an instantiation of an abstract set of mental representations (Biq, Tai & Thompson, 1996). This approach is often referred to as an alternative to the formal (UG) approach to the study of language and its acquisition. Biq et al. (1996) elaborate the difference between the two approaches as follows:

> It [functional approach] takes the position that the primary function of language is for human beings to communicate about their ideas, experiences, feelings, and attitudes in the physical world around them, and that grammatical structures arise from those functions. This position thus challenges the conventional and dominant view of linguistic symbolization, that grammar is an arbitrary, autonomous, self-contained formal system that humans use to interpret, and communicate about, the world. The basic tenet of the functionalist approach is that forms are derived from functions rather than vice versa, thus contrasting with the formalist position, which treats forms as independent of functions (p. 97).

The Cognitive Functionalist Approach draws on the essentials of both Cognitive Linguistics and the functional approach to language studies. Biq et al. (1996) refers to this approach as "a cognition-based functional approach" when it is applied to the study of Chinese grammar. The Cognitive Functionalist Approach emerged during the 1970s. During that time, one of the most widely discussed issues in Chinese language was the "topic-comment" nature of the language (Chao, 1968, p. 70). According to Chao (1968), prototypical "subject-predicate" (p. 70) sentences account for only about fifty percent of Chinese sentences. Following Chao (1968), Henne, Rongen and Jul (1977), Li and Thompson

(1976, 1981), Teng (1974), and Tsao (1979) devoted considerable attention to this issue. Allowing for differences in details, these researchers all agreed that a "topic-comment" relationship must be acknowledged as part of the grammar of Chinese.

The 1980s saw a continued growing interest in a functional approach to Chinese grammar and to relating grammatical and discourse patterns. Scholars who contributed to the development of this approach include Chu (1983, 1986), Huang (1983), Li and Thompson (1981), Li et al. (1983, 1989), Lin (1981), Lü (1980), and Tai (1989a), who synthesized much of the previous functional research.

Tai (1989a) initially proposed the Cognitive Functionalist Approach, which he refers to as a "cognition-based functional approach" (p. 100) to the study of Chinese grammar. Specifically this approach has synthesized three approaches, namely the cognitive approach developed by Lakoff (1987) and Langacker (1987), the semiotic approach developed by Haiman (1985a, 1985b), and the discourse approach developed by Hopper and Thompson (1980, 1984). This Cognitive Functional Approach is characterized by taking human cognition as its basis, and emphasizing that human conceptualization of the physical world is reflected in the grammatical structure of natural language. It aims to "understand the grammar of natural language in general, and of Chinese in particular, in terms of human cognition in conjunction with pragmatic and discourse principles in human communication" (Biq et al., 1996, p. 100).

One of the characteristics of this approach, compared to other functional approaches (e.g., The CM approach), is that it is *cognition-based* in that "human beings' conceptualization of the real world imposes constraints on linguistic structure. This means that both the structure of the human body and the structure of the real world are reflected in grammatical structures" (Biq et al., 1996, p. 100). Biq et al. further explain that people normally prefer 'front' to 'back', and 'up' to 'down' because of our human canonical upright body position, because our eyes are located in our face and not in the back of our head, and because we walk forwards instead of backwards. All human languages share some typological universals and a similar set of vocabulary to describe the world around us because all humans live on the same planet, Earth, where there are trees, stones, mountains, rivers, and so forth. However, languages also exhibit differences, which are considered as reflections of different environments, cultures, and language users' ability to conceptualize the same object or situation from different perspectives according

to their experiences, imagination, and creativity. This indicates that language, instead of being arbitrary as UG claims, is cognition-based and function-driven. This point will be further explained by examining the core areas in the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar.

4.2. Three core areas in the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar

The three core areas of the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, according to Biq et al. (1996), are: *space and time*, *categorization*, and *iconicity*. These will be briefly discussed below in order to show how the syntactic structures of different languages, particularly Chinese and English, reflect different ways of conceptualization in the three areas.

4.2.1. Space and Time

First of all, spatial expressions are considered as more basic than temporal expressions because space is more tangible than time in Chinese, as observed in Biq et al. (1996) "Spatial expressions are treated as more basic, conceptually and grammatically, than non-spatial expressions of various kinds, including time expressions" (p. 103).

Chinese and English language users conceptualize their spatial and temporal relationships differently and the differences are reflected in the syntactic structures and vocabularies of the two languages accordingly. This point is demonstrated with examples below.

For spatial expressions, Chinese and English differ from each other in two aspects. First, the two languages approach spatial scopes differently. A spatial scope refers to the area a space covers. The spatial scope of a country is larger than that of a city in the country. As demonstrated in Tai (1993), the word order for expressing the relationship that one spatial scope comprises part of another larger spatial scope follows the principle of "Whole-Before-Part" (WBP) in Chinese, which means larger scope before smaller scope, as shown in the sequence of address-writing 'country-city-suburb-street-house number' while the word order in English for expressing the same relationship between different spatial scopes follows the principle of "part-before-whole", as shown in the sequence of address-writing in English 'house number-street-suburb-city-country'. Second, although both Chinese and English use a reference object to locate a focal object, the conceptualizing strategies are different between the two languages. Consider the two sentences cited from Biq et al. (1996, p. 103) (1) in Chinese and (2) in English:

(1) *Shu zai xiangzi-de litou* (book be-located box-DE inside).

Shu 'book' is the focal object and *xiangzi* 'box' is the reference object. *Zai* 'to exist, to be located', is used to indicate the existence of an object in some location, and then adding the place word *litou* 'inside' to pinpoint more precisely the nature of the spatial relationship between focal and reference object. It appears that Chinese employs a transparent, two-step strategy in conceptualizing the spatial relationship between focal and reference objects.

(2) The book is in the box.

Similarly to the Chinese sentence above, 'book' is the focal object and 'box' is the reference object. The preposition "in" indicates the spatial relationship between the focal and the reference object. English appears to employ a more opaque, one-step strategy by lexicalizing that spatial relationship in the form of spatial prepositions ('in', 'on', 'at', etc.).

For temporal expressions, Chinese and English also differ from each other in two aspects. First, Chinese follows the principle of placing the 'whole', which means a larger chunk of time, before the 'part', which means a smaller chunk of time, in word order arrangement while English follows the opposite order (Biq et al., 1996). Thus, the word order for temporal expressions in Chinese is from the largest chunk of time to the smallest, as in 'year-month-week-day-hour' order while in English it is generally from the smallest to the largest, as in 'hour-day-week-month-year' order. The month-preceding-date order in American English is an exception.

Second, people who speak Chinese and English talk about time differently – English speakers predominately talk about time as if it were horizontal, while Chinese speakers commonly describe time as if it were both horizontal and vertical (Boroditsky, 2001; Scott, 1989). Although people use spatial metaphors to talk about time, their metaphors are often shaped by their conceptualizations in their native language. For example, while both Chinese and English use horizontal metaphors, such as *qian* 'front/before' and *hou* 'after/back'; only Chinese systematically uses vertical metaphors to talk about time, such as *shang* 'up' and *xia* 'down'. Hence, in Chinese, the previous week and month are referred to as *shang xingqi* 'last week' and *shang ge yue* 'last month'; for the following ones, they are referred to as *xia xingqi* 'next week' and *xia ge yue* 'next month'. In the sentence, *Shang ge xueqi wo xue le san men ke* 'I studied three subjects last semester', *shang* 'up' is a preposition expressing vertical positions, used in the sentence metaphorically

to mean the 'passed' (semester). Boroditsky's (2001) empirical experiments support the claim that Chinese systematically uses both horizontal and vertical metaphors to talk about time while English only uses horizontal metaphors. His experiments also show that language is a powerful tool in shaping thought about abstract domains, such as the temporal and spatial relationships. Due to the interwoven relationship between language and thought, it is not surprising that people's conceptualizations are shaped and reflected in the language they speak.

Within Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, the different syntactic structures employed in Chinese and English for expressing spatial and temporal relationship are accounted for by recognizing that these relationships are conceptualized differently in these two languages. These differences between Chinese and English cannot be readily accounted for within the other three approaches discussed earlier.

4.2.2. Categorization

The importance of categorization in human cognition is recognized by the Cognitive Functionalist Approach to studying language. As Biq et al. (1996) observe:

> Categorization is one of the most important aspects of human cognition. Human language deeply involves categorizing objects and events in the physical world as well as linguistic structures. Lexical items in a language automatically classify objects and actions. In addition, we categorize these lexical items under various parts of speech, such as nouns or verbs. We can further subcategorize nouns into count nouns, mass nouns, and so forth, and verbs into action verbs, stative verbs, etc. Therefore, it is important for a cognition-based functional grammar to have an accurate view of human categorization (p. 104).

There are two approaches to categorization: the classical approach and the 'prototype theory' approach. The former regards a category as being formed by a set of discrete properties that serve as necessary and sufficient criteria to define that category; while the latter regards a category as being formed by typical members (prototype) and less typical members in the fashion of 'family resemblance', as suggested by Wittgenstein, 1953 (in Biq et al., 1996). Family resemblance refers to the phenomenon that categories are not classified according to sharp boundaries and rigid definitions, but by a certain degree of resemblance. For example, 'verb' is a linguistic category. The resemblance between different kinds of verbs is like the resemblance between members of a

family: a father and son may have similar noses, while the same father resembles his daughter more due to a similar jaw structure. Sometimes the resemblance is even less clear than this. There is no set of defining characteristics that all members of a family share, but the resemblance between them still exists.

Such resemblance exists between all members of a category, for instance, the category of 'bird', according to the prototype theory approach of classification. In such classification, there is usually a prototype in each category. The prototype is a typical member of this category. For example, the prototype for the category 'bird' can be a robin in English, and it can be a sparrow in Chinese; depending on how often people see a particular bird in their life.

Cognitive Functionalist Grammar adopts prototype theory of categorization in treating linguistic categorization. This approach to categorization is widely used in semantic studies. For example, Huang (1987) studied the meanings of *xiao* 'filial piety' and *mianzi* 'face' in terms of prototype theory. Discussions of lexical categories in terms of prototype theory can also be found in Iljic (1988), McCawley (1992), Tai (1982), and Thompson (1988).

Another example of applying the prototype approach in categorization is to study the rich system of classifiers in Chinese. Tai and Wang (1990) found that the classifier *tiao* is cognition-based, in that it is used to classify objects that are column-shaped, and not just to classify different types of nouns. Different melons are all called *gua* in Chinese, but only those *gua* that are column-shaped can be classified using *tiao* (e.g. *yi tiao huanggua* 'a cucumber', *yi tiao kugua* 'a bitter melon', and *yi tiao sigua* 'a towel melon'). Melons that are rounder, such as, *xigua* 'watermelon' and *donggua* 'winter melon or wax gourd', cannot be classified using *tiao*, instead using *ge* (e.g. *yi ge xigua* 'one watermelon' and *yi ge donggua* 'one winter melon'). Tai and Wang (1990) also describe the metaphorical extensions of *tiao* to classify abstract entities, such as *xinwen* 'news item' in *yi tiao xinwen* 'a piece of news', *falü* 'legal article' in *yi tiao falü* 'a legal article' and *mingling* 'order or command' in *yi tiao mingling* 'an order', wherein news items, legal articles and so forth have traditionally been written vertically on a page in Chinese, resembling a column-shaped object. A subsequent study of classifier systems across Chinese dialects by Tai (1992a) shows that these systems are also cognition-based in employing shape, size, consistency and the whole-part relation, and their pattern of distribution can be accounted for by prototype theory.

A better understanding of different nouns and verbs can also be achieved by applying the prototypical approach to the categorization of nouns and verbs, which forms the cornerstone of the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar. Biq et al. (1996) argue that, "The cognitive basis for prototypical nouns is the set of physical, tangible objects, such as books, houses, and trees, and that for prototypical verbs is the set of visible, dynamic actions such as jump, run, and hit" (p. 106). However, not all nouns and verbs are prototypical. Table 2.1 shows three types of nouns and verbs categorized by prototype theory, which is revised from Biq et al. (1996, p. 106–107).

Table 2.1 Categorization of nouns and verbs in prototype theory

	Most prototypical	**Less prototypical**	**Least prototypical**
Nouns	count nouns, concrete, individual	tangible mass nouns	abstract nouns
Classifiers	co-occur with prototypical classifiers	containers as measure words, and only solid can pile up	restricted and abstract measure words, such as *zhong* 'kind/type', *xie* 'some'
Examples	*yi ben shu* 'a book', *yi zhang zhuozi* 'a table'	*yi bei shui* 'a glass of water', *yi wan mifan* 'a bowl of rice'	*yi zhong meide* 'a type of virtue', *yi xie fuqi* 'some luck'
Verbs	depict physical activities visible to the human eye	depict non-physical activities	stative verbs
Temporal structure	durative, covering beginning and ending point, can take various aspect markers and can co-occur with verbal measures	do not involve physical movement of body parts and cannot co-occur with verbal measures	coincide with only resultative ending point and thus only take perceptive *le* and not imperfectives *zai* and *zhe*
Examples	*ti* 'kick', *da* 'hit' *ti ta yi jiao* 'give him a kick'	*ai* 'love', *xiang* 'think' **ai ta yi xin* 'love him one heart'	*si* 'die', *faxian* 'discover' **ta si zhe* 'he is dying' (acceptable in English)

As illustrated in Table 2.1, the more prototypical the noun or verb, the more it exhibits the clusters of syntactic behaviours, and the more flexibility it can have in word order arrangement, associated with its

respective syntactic category of nouns or verbs. For example, the NVN word order is common and natural for all the three types of nouns as in *Mali huan shu* 'Mary returned her book', *Mali he shui* 'Mary drank some water' and *Mali you meide* 'Mary has virtue'. However, the NNV word order is only common and natural for the most prototypical noun *shu* 'book' as in *Shu Mali huan le* 'The book, Mary returned it'; but not for *shui* 'water' as in **Shui Mali he le*[5] 'The water, Mary drank it', neither for *meide* 'virtue' as in **Meide Mali you le*[6] 'The virtue, Mary had it.' Such cognition-based categories of nouns and verbs and their various flexibilities in word order arrangement are not well accounted for in the other three linguistic approaches discussed earlier, namely, the UG approach, the PT approach and the CM approach.

4.2.3. Iconicity

In Cognitive Linguistics, iconicity refers to "the conceived similarity between a form of language and its meaning" (Encyclopaedia, 2005). The three iconic principles are:

(1) Quantity principle: formal complexity corresponds to conceptual complexity;
(2) Proximity principle: conceptual distance tends to match with linguistic distance;
(3) Sequential order principle: the sequential order of events described is mirrored in the speech chain.

Among the three principles, the sequential order principle is the most relevant to word order arrangement. Chinese language proves to be a case in point in that it strictly observes this iconic principle, as Ho (1993) states, "in terms of linear sequence, there is a close correlation or natural iconicity between word order (syntactic structure) and world order (logic relations and natural order of occurrences)" (p. 141) in Chinese.

Haiman (1985a) argues that due to the recognized trade-off between morphological marking and syntax in the establishing of semantic relationship, isolating and analytic languages are likely to be more iconic

5. Having in mind that a particular glass of water is drunk by Mary, we can say *Shui, Mali he le*, but this sentence is not a common expression at all.
6. Although we can say *Meide, Mali you de*, the verb *you* is changed from an action verb into a state verb, which is not the original verb any more.

than those displaying a heavy reliance on morphology. Evidence from Chinese provides strong support for this claim (Siewierska, 1988). Tai (1985, 1989a, 1989b, 1992a, 1992b, 1993) demonstrates through a series of works that iconicity is one of the dominant factors governing word order in Chinese. The iconicity motivation in word order arrangement is specifically instantiated in Tai's (1985) Chinese word order principle, namely the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS). PTS manifests itself in that "The relative word order between syntactic units is determined by the temporal order of the states that they represent in the conceptual world" (Tai, 1985, p. 50). In other words, this principle organizes linguistic structures in such a way that the order of linguistic elements follows the order of the temporal order of states that they represent. For example, in expressing the meaning "I want to be a doctor after I grow up", 'I grow up' has to precede 'I want to be a doctor' in Chinese resulting in *Wo zhangda hou yao dang yisheng* because 'I' need to grow up first before 'I' can be a doctor. PTS is so deeply entrenched in the Chinese grammar that it cannot be treated merely as a pragmatic principle.

Biq et al. (1996) have stated that "the simplest as well as the most economical way for linguistic structures to reflect humans' conceptual structures of the physical world is through iconicity" (p. 107). Chinese proves to be a case in point, particularly manifesting iconicity through linear word order.

As demonstrated through the above-mentioned studies dealing with the three core areas of the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, it appears that this approach adequately explains Chinese word order. Moreover, the different conceptualizations in Chinese and English potentially account for the Chinese L2 word order errors made by adult English-speaking learners. For example, in the first core area, namely, *space and time*, Chinese observes the Whole-Before-Part Principle (WBP) in expressing spatial and temporal relationships while English observes the opposite word order, namely Part-Before-Whole. In the second core area, *categorization*, the more prototypical the noun or verb, the more it exhibits the clusters of syntactic behaviours and the more flexibility it can have in word order arrangement in Chinese, while English follows a rigid SVO word order irrespective of noun or verb types. In the third core area, *iconicity*, Chinese observes the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) in arranging the word order of relevant events and situations while English does not. Therefore, the Cognitive Functionalist Approach is the most suitable framework to guide the present project.

5. Conclusion

In order to determine the most adequate theoretical framework to guide the present research of developing a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors, this chapter has reviewed four theoretical approaches employed to investigate L2 word order acquisition.

UG hypothesizes word order as a parameter value and the acquisition of L2 word order as parameter resetting. Although this approach provides a potential account for L2 word order errors theoretically, in that languages differ in their setting values of a given UG parameter and learner language may manifest L1 rather than L2 value if the resetting in L2 is lacking, it is not adequate to guide the present research project because (1) L2 learners might not have access to UG at all; (2) this approach is theory-driven and many important issues in SLA do not receive high priority; and (3) UG-based studies mainly rely on grammaticality judgment test as a data collecting method, which is unlikely to enable the project to collect L2 word order errors.

The PT approach argues that L2 word order acquisition is constrained not only by the declarative grammatical knowledge, but also by the processing procedures of the knowledge. A certain word order sequence is acquired earlier than others due to the degree of complexity in processing. Although the processing hierarchy identified in the PT successfully explains the developmental sequence of different word order structures in L2 German, English and Swedish, where the word order is syntactically constrained at a sentence level, it is problematic to guide the present study because (1) it is difficult to apply this approach to Chinese where the word order is largely pragmatically constrained; (2) this approach, similar to the UG approach, does not describe various L2 word order structures, nor does it explain how L2 word order errors occur; and (3) it is limited to a longitudinal design due to its emergence criterion methodology.

The CM approach provides a particular advantage in cross-linguistic comparison of word order cue-strength/weight between a form and its function. The different cue-strengths of word order and its functions in L1 and L2 can explain word order errors in learners' TL. However, although this approach provides an adequate account for word order errors in relation to the *agent* in a sentence, it remains limited in its domain of application. Up to now, only one function, namely, agent role identification, has been investigated and the domain of application

seems difficult to extend. Moreover, the CM is an artificial paradigm-driven approach in that it only tests two-noun and one-verb simple sentences and grammatically incorrect sentences. Therefore, it is also problematic to apply this approach to the present study.

The Cognitive Functionalist Approach is found to be the best theoretical framework for this study. It takes human cognition as its basis and underscores that human conceptualization of the physical world is reflected in the grammatical structure of natural languages. It argues that language structure, instead of being arbitrary as UG claims, is cognition-based and function-driven. Moreover, different conceptualizations of the physical world by native speakers can provide an explanation for the different structures of the languages they speak. This point has been demonstrated through the review of three core areas in the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, namely *space and time*, *categorization* and *iconicity*. Studies in the three core areas indicate that Chinese word order is likely to be governed by underlying principles, such as the Whole-Before-Part Principle (WBP) in expressing spatial and temporal relationships and the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) in arranging word order of relevant events and situations. In contrast, English follows Part-Before-Whole Principle in expressing spatial and temporal relationships and does not strictly observe PTS in arranging word order of relevant events and situations. Moreover, the more prototypical the noun or verb, the more it exhibits the clusters of syntactic behaviours, and the more flexibility it can have in word order arrangement in Chinese; while English follows a rigid SVO word order irrespective of noun or verb types. These differences in Chinese and English provide great potential to account for various word order errors made by adult English-speaking learners of Chinese.

Now the theoretical framework to guide the present research project has been established. It is time to examine specific studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition and word order errors. Given the apparent importance of PTS and WBP in explaining word order phenomena in Chinese, it is also necessary to see to what extent the roles of PTS and WBP have been investigated in the literature and how these principles can be applied to specifically account for different types of word order errors.

Chapter Three: Review of the literature (2) Chinese L2 word order acquisition, word order errors and word order principles

The previous chapter reviewed four theoretical approaches used in L2 word order acquisition research. The Cognitive Functionalist Approach has been established as a theoretical framework to guide the development of a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. This approach argues that human conceptualization of the physical world is reflected in the grammatical structure of a natural language. It argues that language structure, instead of being arbitrary as UG claims, is cognition-based and function-driven. Conceptualizations of the physical world by native speakers can provide an explanation for the different structures of the languages they speak, particularly in the three core areas in the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, namely *space and time*, *categorization* and *iconicity*. In relation to Chinese word order, native speakers' conceptualization is reflected in underlying word order principles such as the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) and Whole-Before-Part (WBP). In contrast, English does not strictly observe PTS. Moreover, rather than observing WBP as Chinese does, English observes the opposite, namely Part-Before-Whole principle. These differences provide great potential to account for the word order errors made by adult English-speaking learners of Chinese.

This chapter reviews studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition, word order errors and word order principles. It consists of four sections. The first section reviews Chinese L2 word order acquisition studies in order to see to what extent the roles of the two word order principles PTS and WBP have been investigated. The second section examines what taxonomies of Chinese L2 word order errors are currently available in the literature in order for the present study to build on. The third section explores whether the two underlying word order principles (PTS and WBP) have any explanatory value for the word order error categories identified in section two and evaluates the need to systematically

review Chinese word order principles. The final section reviews Chinese word order principles and provide examples to show how these principles govern Chinese word order and its variations.

1. Studies of Chinese L2 word order acquisition

This section reviews Chinese L2 word order acquisition studies in order to determine what has been achieved and to what extent the roles of PTS and WBP have been investigated. Four studies were found through conducting searches in two authoritative linguistic databases, LLBA (1973-2004/06) and MLA (1963-2004/06). Table 3.1 below lists the details of the four studies.

Table 3.1 Four studies of Chinese word order acquisition found in LLBA and MLA

Author	Title
1. Yu, Shuhuai	Word Order and Topic Prominence in the Interlanguage of an Australian Learner of Chinese
2. Xu, Yuzeng	The Position of the Adverb in Chinese Foreign Language Development
3. Hu, Mingliang	Word order, Discourse and Language Learning
4. Li, Wendan	Second Language Acquisition of Discourse- and Pragmatically-Governed Word Order in Mandarin Chinese

The four studies contributed to Chinese word order acquisition research from different perspectives. Yu (1986) investigated the position of noun and adjective, and verb and adverb. Xu (1988), following the 'emergence' methodology employed by the ZISA project, studied the developmental sequence of Chinese adverbs. Hu (1992) examined the function of word order in developing coherent topic-comment discourse in Chinese. Li (1999) focused on the acquisition of eleven Chinese topic-comment sentences.

These studies are evaluated using four criteria: (1) the range the study covers; (2) the way Chinese L2 word order acquisition is investigated; (3) generalizablity of the findings; and (4) the theoretical framework used to explain the findings.

1.1. Yu's 1986 study

Yu (1986) studied one Australian learner of Chinese, who had been learning Chinese for three years when his interlanguage was investigated. Ten tapes, each of sixty minutes duration, were collected in March 1984 by the researcher. Two types of data were collected: (a) spontaneous speech recordings, in which the subject was engaged in conversations; and (b) elicitation, in which the subject was asked questions about his daily life. For the analysis of word order features, each taped utterance was examined and transcribed. Forty examples of adjective + noun (AN) and noun + adjective (NA) word order utterances and another forty examples of adverb + verb (Adv.V) and verb + adverb (VAdv.) word order utterances were extracted. Yu's study revealed that after learning Chinese for three years the learner still had problems with word order since a fairly large percentage of his utterances were erroneous. For example, (10) demonstrates word order error that involved adjective and noun (N-A) and (11) demonstrates word order error that involved adverb and verb (V-Adv):

(10a) *我 不 喜欢 天气 下雨 的。
Wo bu xihuan tianqi xiayu de.
I not like weather rainy
I don't like rainy weather.

(10b) 我 不 喜欢 下雨 的 天气。
Wo bu xihuan xiayu de tianqi.
I not like rainy weather
I don't like rainy weather.

In (10), *tianqi* 'weather' is a noun and *xiayu de* 'rainy' is an adjective that modifies the noun *tianqi*. The correct word order is that an adjective precedes the noun it modifies as shown in (10b).

(11a) *我 的 朋友 学 中文 努力。
Wo de pengyou xue zhongwen nuli.
My friend study Chinese hard
My friend studies Chinese hard.

(11b) 我 的 朋友 努力 学 中文。
Wo de pengyou nuli xue zhongwen.
My friend study hard Chinese
My friend studies Chinese hard.

In (11), *xue zhongwen* 'study Chinese' is a verb phrase (VP) and *nuli* 'hard' is an adverb that modifies the VP. The correct word order in Chinese is that an adverb precedes the verb it modifies, as shown in (11b).

Yu (1986) identified two types of word order errors and their frequencies are:

Noun-Adjective (N-A): 15 instances, error percentage: 15/40 = 38%
Verb-Adverb (V-Adv): 18 instances, error percentage: 18/40 = 45%

In relation to N-A errors, Yu hypothesized that when a foreign language learner of Chinese overuses the topic prominence feature of the language, s/he may produce N-A word order phrases. Yu explained the V-Adv errors as L1 (English) transfer because adverbs often occur after the verb in English when the verb is intransitive in a sentence, e.g. *Tom runs fast*.

Yu also found that, among all the sentences the learner produced, approximately 25% were topic-comment sentences. Moreover, the learner's topic-comment sentences contained a repeated topic at the end of the sentence, which is deviant from the normative use by a Chinese native speaker. For example:

(12a) *牛肉　我 喜欢　牛肉。
Niurou wo xihuan niurou.
Beef I like beef
I do like beef.

(12b) 牛肉　我 喜欢。
Niurou wo xihuan.
Beef I like
I do like beef.

To explain this phenomenon, Yu (1986) hypothesized that:

> When a foreign language learner of Chinese overuses the feature of topic prominence, besides producing N-A word-order phrases, he may also produce over-topic-prominent sentences in which the topic occurs again at the end of a sentence (p. 88).

As a pioneering study of Chinese L2 word order acquisition, one cannot overstate the importance and influence of Yu's (1986) study, which contributes to Chinese L2 word order acquisition research in

that it raises awareness that Chinese L2 word order acquisition is complicated and deserves more attention.

Yet, at the same time, as a pioneering study, limitations are inevitable. Firstly, he focused on the word order of adjective and noun, and adverb and verb, which comprise a fairly small portion of word order structures. So, the range is quite narrow. Secondly, he only investigated the learner's interlanguage at one point in time, so it was not possible to see how Chinese L2 word order develops through time and whether the learner made different word order errors at different proficiency levels. Thirdly, he studied only one learner, which means the findings are unlikely to be generalizable. Fourthly, no theoretical framework was found to guide Yu's study. He did not provide adequate explanation as to how he developed his hypothesis that a Chinese L2 learner may produce over-topic-prominent features like N-A errors and over-topic-prominent sentences like (12a) above. Despite these limitations, the two types of word order error, namely N-A and N-Adv, should be considered as elements to be included in developing a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors.

1.2. Xu's 1988 study

Xu (1988) examined the developmental sequence of Chinese L2 word order with a focus on adverb acquisition. Following the 'emergence' methodology employed by the ZISA project, which has been promoted by Pienemann (1998) in his Processability Theory (PT) as discussed in Chapter Two (p. 45), Xu collected oral data from three adult native-English-speaking learners. The three learners had had 2 hours of Chinese lessons with him per week for 2 years and 9 months, from March 1986 to December 1988. These lessons were audiotaped and relevant utterances were transcribed. He recorded all the utterances containing an adverb. He then categorized them into three groups according to the position of the adverb (initial, middle or final) in each utterance. At the same time, the time of occurrence of each structure with an adverb was recorded.

The aim of Xu's study was to establish whether Chinese adverb acquisition followed the developmental sequence identified by the ZISA project on German L2 word order acquisition (see Chapter Two, section 2.4, p. 37). The developmental sequence of adverb acquisition in German L2 is as follows (Clahsen, 1984; Pienemann, 1985):

Stage 1. SVO + Adv (Adv final)
Stage 2. Adv + SVO (Adv initial)
Stage 3. S + Adv + VO or SV + Adv + O (Adv insertion)

Xu found that the three learners of Chinese, in their adverb acquisition, did not follow the developmental sequence of German L2 word order, as shown above. Instead, their developmental sequence was determined to be:

Stage 1. S + Adv + VO (Adv insertion) and SVO + Adv (Adv final)
Stage 2. Adv + SVO (Adv initial)

Xu accounted for the different developmental sequences of Chinese L2 and German L2 adverb word order acquisition by language-specific features of the two languages, without specifying what kind of features may be responsible for the difference.

Xu compared the development of Chinese L2 word order with that of German L2 word order. His study is enlightening for Chinese L2 word order acquisition research in that: (1) it confirmed that Chinese L2 adverb acquisition development has its own characteristics; and (2) Chinese language-specific features are important for explaining the sequence of Chinese L2 word order acquisition. However, Xu's (1988) study is also limited in that (1) only adverb acquisition was investigated, so the range is also quite narrow; (2) he categorized all the structures according to the position of adverbs without differentiating target-like forms (well-formed structures) from non-target-like forms (errors); (3) although the findings are somewhat more generalizable than those of Yu's (1986) study based on only one L2 learner, they are still restricted since they were obtained by studying only three learners; and (4) although this study did employ a theoretical framework, namely the Multidimensional Model, as mentioned in Chapter Two (see p. 45), Xu did not provide a convincing explanation for his findings. He accounted for the different developmental sequences of adverb acquisition in Chinese L2 and German L2 by their "language-specific features" without specifying what those language-specific features are.

Nevertheless, Xu's study underscored the importance of Chinese word order features in the Chinese L2 word order acquisition process although he did not directly investigate the roles of PTS and WBP. He accounted for the difference between Chinese L2 and German L2 adverb word order acquisition development by language-specific features of both Chinese and German. As is demonstrated in section 4

in this chapter (see p. 81), Chinese word order principles govern "language-specific features" of Chinese word order.

1.3. Hu's 1992 study

Hu (1992) compared the cohesive devices employed in connecting sentences or clauses into well-developed passages in Chinese and English. He found that Chinese relies more on word order while English relies more on lexical items such as articles and pronouns. He then demonstrated with examples how native-English-speaking CFL learners interrupted textual cohesion in their Chinese passage writing due to misuse of word order. Sentence (13) B below is one of the examples Hu used to demonstrate the inappropriateness of word order in the context provided:

(13) A: 我 要 买 到 巴黎 的 票。
Wo yao mai dao Bali de piao.
I want buy to Paris *de* ticket
I want to buy a ticket to Paris.

B: #你 到 **对** 的 地方 **来** 了。
*Ni dao **dui** de difang **lai** le.*
You to right *de* place come LE
You have come to the right place.

In the example above, Speaker A is requesting to buy a ticket to Paris. Speaker B then tells Speaker A that he has come to the right place, that is, the place where he can purchase the ticket he wants. Sentence (13) B is inappropriate in this context, though grammatically correct independently, because "the placement of *dui* 'right' before *difang* 'place' does not mark *dui* as a comment, as required by the discourse" (p. 77). Hu further explains that in this context (13) B should be re-written to (13) C or (13) D to make the word order arrangements appropriate:

(13) C: 你 **来** **对** 地方 了。
*Ni **lai** **dui** difang le.*
You come right place LE
You have come to the right place.

D: 这个 地方 你 **来** **对** 了。
*Zhege difang ni **lai** **dui** le.*
This M place you come correct LE
You have come to the right place.

Hu cited two other word order errors due to inappropriateness in context as follows:

(14) A1: 我 的 家 离 这儿 远。
Wo de jia li zher yuan.
My home from here far
My home is far from here

A2: #所以, 现在 我 有 家 在 佛罗里达。
Suoyi, xianzai wo you jia zai Florida.
Therefore, now I have home at Florida
Therefore I now have a home in Florida.

The correct form of A2 is as follows:

A2: 所以, 现在 在 佛罗里达 我 有 家。
Suoyi, xianzai zai Florida wo you jia.
Therefore, now at Florida I have home
Therefore I now have a home in Florida.

(15) A: 你 要 在 什么 地方 结婚?
Ni yao zai shenme difang jiehun?
You want exist what place marry
Where do you want to get married?

B: #我 在 杭州 要 结婚。
Wo zai Hangzhou yao jiehun.
I at *Hangzhou* want marry
I want to get married in *Hangzhou.*

The correct form of 15 B is as follows:

B: 我 要 在 杭州 结婚。
Wo yao zai Hangzhou jiehun.
I want at *Hangzhou* marry
I want to get married in *Hangzhou.*

Due to the many errors in word order in certain contexts, as shown in (13) B, (14) A2 and (15) B, Hu concluded that the CFL learners had difficulty with word order at a discourse level. His contribution to Chinese L2 word order acquisition lies in the following three aspects:

(1) He demonstrated that word order plays a more important role in Chinese than in English in developing coherent discourse.

(2) He illustrated with examples that the CFL learners often failed to use word order or misused word order in Chinese discourse. In other words, word order errors lie not only in ungrammaticality but also in inappropriateness.
(3) He indicated that there are two levels in the acquisition of word order in Chinese. One is at the sentence level; and the other is at the discourse level. L1 interference in discourse is different from that in sentences. While L1 interference at a sentence level may cause ungrammaticality, L1 interference at the level of discourse does not necessarily cause ungrammaticality, but it may cause inappropriateness in the context. That is why the individual clauses of a learner's interlanguage may be grammatically correct in isolation, but may not be appropriate in discourse.

Nevertheless, Hu's study is limited in that (1) only word order errors due to inappropriateness were examined leaving word order errors due to ungrammaticality unattended; (2) he cited mostly anecdotal examples from the native-English-speaking CFL learners' written samples to demonstrate his point and did not base his claim on systematically collected empirical data; (2) it is difficult to judge the generalizability of the findings when the data was collected on an anecdotal basis; and (4) no theoretical framework was used to guide the study and to explain the findings. His explanation of the inappropriateness of sentences like (13) B as "the placement of *dui* 'right' before *difang* 'place' does not mark *dui* as a comment, as required by the discourse" is not sufficiently clear. A better explanation as to why sentences like (13) B are inappropriate is called for (see p. 80 in this chapter).

In sum, Hu identified one category of word order error as illustrated in (13) B, (14) A2 and (15) B, namely word order errors due to contextual inappropriateness. His findings are enlightening for the present study in that word order errors not only lie in ungrammaticality but also in inappropriateness, both of which are considered as criteria in identifying Chinese L2 word order errors in this study. This point is further elaborated in Chapter Four on methodology.

1.4. Li's 1999 study

Li (1999) investigated eleven topic-comment sentences classified according to semantic and word order characteristics. These eleven topic-comment sentences were categorized firstly according to the semantic content of the NP_1. Thus, Group A (indicated by the letter 'A' in the

coding) has temporal expressions in the position of NP_1; Group B has locative expressions; and Group C has Patient in NP_1 positions. In Types D and E, the NP_1 position is filled by Agent and Patient respectively, but these NPs form a certain kind of semantic relationship (whole-part, possessor-possessee, etc.) with another NP in the sentence. The numbers in the coding (e.g. A1, A2, A3) indicate the categorization of the order of other sentential elements such as agent (A), verb (V) and patient (P). For example, $NP_1AVP + A1$ stands for a sentence that starts with an NP_1 of time (+A1), followed by an agent, then a verb and a patient. The sentence *Jintian wo kanjian ta le* 'Today I saw him' belongs to this category. Table 3.2 shows the structures of the eleven sentences:

Table 3.2 Tabulation of the word order categories according to their semantic characteristics and word order

	Type A NP_1 = time	Type B NP_1 = location	Type C NP_1 = patient	Type D NP_1→Agent*	Type E NP_1→Patient
NP_1AVP	A1	B1		D1	E1
NP_1AV			C1		
NP_1VP	A2	B2			E2
NP_1VA	A3	B3			
NP_1V			C2		

(source: Li, 1999, p. 43)
*Note: '→' reads as 'is related to'. NP_1 stands for 'sentence initial noun phrase'. 'A' stands for 'agent', 'V' stands for 'verb', and 'P' stands for 'patient'.

Li studied 49 subjects grouped into three proficiency levels (17 beginners, 16 intermediate and 16 advanced). Two experiments were carried out to examine the L2 learners' use of the 11 categories of simple sentences. The first was a judgement task to reveal the subjects' abilities to recognize appropriate word order, and the second a translation task to reveal their ability to produce appropriate word order.

Two written items were created for each of the 11 categories, which made 22 items. A context was created for each of the 22 items. The same items were used for both tasks. These items were mixed with 18 distractors and presented to the subjects in random order.

In the judgement task, Li's subjects were instructed to judge the provided sentences on the following 4-point scale:

3- grammatical and appropriate for the context
2- grammatical but inappropriate for the context
1- basically okay, but has minor errors
0- ungrammatical

In the translation task, the subjects were provided with the words to be used in their translation in order to reduce the difficulty of the task. They were also told to arrange these words in an order that is appropriate for the provided context in Chinese. The above 4-point scale scoring system was also applied to the translation task. Through the above tasks, Li found:

(1) There were significant differences in the learners' judgement of the 11 categories. This was taken as evidence for the different degrees of difficulty in learning the 11 categories.
(2) Two important factors determining the degrees of difficulty were identified: the semantic characteristics of the word order categories and the influence of the learners' L1. More specifically, the categories in which the NP_1s were locative and temporal expressions were relatively easier to learn. When NP_1s were semantically related to the agent or the patient in the following clause and received thematic roles through this relationship, the categories were more difficult to acquire.
(3) Error analysis of the sentences collected from the translation task showed that the majority of errors were grammatical but inappropriate for the context. It was the appropriateness of the word order and its variations that were difficult for the learners to acquire.
(4) Grammaticality and appropriateness were achieved by learners at different stages of learning and were acquired separately. In Li's words, "Usually, grammaticality has a priority. Later on, when grammaticality is under better control, the focus of attention will be shifted to appropriateness of structures" (p. 53).

Result (3) replicates Hu's (1992) finding discussed in section 1.3 above. Hu discerned two types of word order errors from an L1 interference perspective: L1 interference at sentence level caused word order errors due to ungrammaticality while L1 interference at discourse level caused word order errors due to inappropriateness. Li (1999) identified the two types of word order errors from a developmental perspective: grammaticality was developed earlier than appropriateness.

In addition, Li (1999, p. 58) categorized CFL word order errors collected from the translation task into three types. Errors that did not belong to these three categories and responses with more than one error type were placed into a miscellaneous group:

Type 1: English order (only acceptable in English, not in Chinese)
e.g. *Wo kan guo zheiben shu yiqian.*
I read P this M book in the past

Type 2: Grammatical in both English and Chinese (but inappropriate for the context)
e.g. *Yiqian wo kan guo zheiben shu.*
In the past I read P this M book

Type 3: Chinese canonical order (inappropriate for the context, not acceptable in English)
e.g. *Wo yiqian kan guo zheiben shu.*
I in the past read P this M book

Type 4: Miscellaneous group

Through this categorization of word order errors, Li meant to trace the causes of these errors. Theoretically, Type 1 word order errors are caused by L1 (English) transfer. Type 2 and Type 3 word order errors are caused by an inability to arrange word order according to discourse contexts. However, these causes of word order errors are still too vague for learners to understand how these errors occurred. It is unlikely that this categorization can be of use to better understand these errors.

Moreover, the theoretical basis for Li's categorization is not consistent with interlanguage theory. Interlanguage is defined as "a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a target language norm" (Selinker, 1974, p. 35). According to interlanguage theory, learner language is an independent language with its own grammar (Selinker, 1974; Ellis, 1994). This means that to claim the word order of an interlanguage sentence either follows native language or target language overlooks the creative role of learners in their L2 learning.

Practically, Li's categorization is based on specific, limited and predesigned simple sentences in a translation task where English word order and Chinese word order can possibly be discerned. Such a categorization is not very practical when applied to a large number of word

order errors that are directly produced by L2 learners and where the English word order and Chinese word order cannot be easily discerned. In other words, Li's categorization only applies to a limited range of word order structures. For example, (16) below was collected from the present study. It is difficult to ascertain whether the word order in (16a) is an English word order or not.

(16a) *我 已经 **三天** 来 北京 了。
*Wo yijing **santian** lai Beijing le.*
I already three days come Beijing LE.
It has been three days since I came to Beijing.

(16b) 我 已经 来 北京 **三天** 了。
*Wo yijing lai Beijing **santian** le.*
I already come Beijing three days LE.
It has been three days since I came to Beijing.

Since L1 word order and L2 word order are not the only factors in determining learners' interlanguage word order, it is rather arbitrary to say whether the word order of a sentence follows English word order or Chinese word order. Moreover, even when one can determine that a Chinese L2 word order error is due to English (L1) word order transfer or the inability to arrange Chinese word order according to discourse context, such information is still not sufficient to explain the operating system governing Chinese word order arrangement. Therefore, Li's categorization is unlikely to be helpful for teachers to better explain Chinese word order and for learners to improve their word order acquisition. Due to these reasons, Li's categorization will not be further explored in this study.

In sum, despite the aforementioned contributions, Li's study is limited in that (1) she focused on the acquisition of 11 simple and short topic-comment sentences, which covers a narrow range of word order structures; (2) Li predesigned the 11 sentence structures and tested them with both a grammaticality judgement task and a translation task while SLA studies usually need to investigate learners' own speech or writing; (3) the generalizability of the findings is limited due to the methodology used. As discussed in Chapter Two (see p. 31), the reliability of the grammaticality judgement task has been questioned. In the translation task, there was also a possibility that the word order was randomly arranged because the subjects were provided with the words to be used

in their translation; and (4) no major theoretical framework was used to guide the study and to explain the findings.

So far the four studies of Chinese L2 word order acquisition have been critically evaluated. No extendable word order error taxonomy has been found, although these studies have otherwise contributed to Chinese word order acquisition research. None of the four studies have examined the roles of the two word order principles, namely PTS and WBP. Without referring to these two principles, it is unlikely that Chinese L2 word order errors can be adequately explained since PTS and WBP are so deeply entrenched in the Chinese grammar, as demonstrated in Chapter Two (p. 54). Other available word order error taxonomies need to be examined.

2. Studies on Chinese L2 word order errors

As discussed above (section 1.4), Li's (1999) Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy is not further explored in this study due to its inconsistency with interlanguage theory and its narrow application range in practice. This section reviews studies on Chinese L2 word order errors in order to examine what other taxonomies are available in the literature.

2.1. Error Analysis (EA) in Chinese L2 research

Despite the fact that teaching Chinese as a foreign language has a relatively long history in the field of SLA, there are very few data-based studies, either in Chinese or English language journals, on how L2 learners learn Chinese or how their interlanguage is structured and developed (Ko, 1997; Polio, 1994). For example, Lu (1997) conducted a series of studies employing Error Analysis (EA) of Chinese L2. However, his study was not based on empirical data. He first provided the categories of errors, such as phonological, lexical, syntactic and pragmatic, and then provided examples for each of the categories.

Ko's (1997) unpublished doctoral dissertation entitled *Error analysis and its application to Chinese language teaching* is the only study found in the literature that is empirically data-driven. Compared to the earlier prescribed four error categories in Lu's (1997) study, namely phonological, lexical, syntactic and pragmatic, Ko's (1997) study moved a big

step forward in error analysis of Chinese L2. The study analyzed 506 production errors from interview data from beginning/intermediate/advanced CFL learners. These errors have been classified into eight categories. They are *improper word order, misuse of vocabulary, misuse of word function, measure words, improvised vocabulary, unique sentence patterns, misuse of negation words 'bu' & 'mei'* and *covert errors*. These categories also demonstrate that language error types are not generic to all languages. Table 3.3 below shows the eight categories of errors in Chinese L2 were identified.

Table 3.3 Chinese L2 error types and their percentages in Ko (1997)

Category	Error type	Error distribution		Percentage of Total (%)
1	Improper word order		135	27
a.	Time and place words	48		
b.	Modification structure	14		
c.	Topic-comment relation	26		
d.	Miscellaneous	47		
2	Misuse of vocabulary		214	42
3	Misuse of word function		77	15
4	Measure words		24	5
a.	Missing measure words	16		
b.	Improper use of measure words	8		
5	Improvised vocabulary		21	4
6	Unique sentence patterns		25	5
7	Misuse of negation words 'bu' & 'mei'		6	1
8	Covert errors		4	1
Total			506	100

(Source: Ko, 1997, p. 52)

Among the eight categories of errors identified in Ko's (1997) study, word order errors are most relevant to the present study. The three-category taxonomy of word order errors, namely *Time and Place Words, Modification Structures* and *Topic-comment Relations,* is the only taxonomy of word order errors emerging from empirical data. The three categories of this taxonomy are elaborated in more detail below.

2.2. Ko's (1997) word order error taxonomy

Ko's (1997, p. 52) categories of word order errors and their respective percentages are shown in Table 3.4:

Table 3.4 Ko's (1997) Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy

Category	**No. of errors**	**Percentage (%)**
Time and Place Words	48	36
Modification Structures	14	10
Topic-comment Relations	26	19
Miscellaneous	47	35
Total	135	100

Although preliminary, this categorization shows that L2 learners of Chinese, among other things, have a particular problem with word order arrangement regarding *time and place* words, *modification structures* and *topic-comment relations*. Yet forty-seven word order errors accounting for 35% of the total are categorized as miscellaneous, which conveys both a difficulty in categorizing the word order errors and a deficiency in the method employed. The criteria for Ko's categorization remain unclear. For example, the first category appears to be determined by semantic properties, namely words expressing time and place. However, the reason why "time" and "place" words are classified into one category remains unclear. The second category appears to be determined by syntactic considerations since *Modification Structure* involves at least two constituents with one modifying another. The third category appears also to be determined by syntactic considerations since a Topic-comment Relation involves a syntactic structure being composed by at least two constituents with the first one being a topic and the second one being a comment. Moreover, Ko's explanations of word order arrangement in the three categories are also problematic. These are discussed below:

Category 1: Time and Place Words

In terms of temporal expressions, Ko differentiates between "time words" and "temporal duration", which is a good point to make because these two types of temporal expressions are often positioned dif-

ferently in word order arrangement. In explaining the differences between the two kinds of temporal expressions, Ko states:

> In Chinese, Time Words are words that describe a point in time. *Xingqisan* "Wednesday", *yiyue* "January", and *san dianzhong* "three o'clock" are examples of Time Words. Time Words are also used to indicate the specific temporal location of actions or events. Under such circumstances, they **must** [emphasis added] appear before the verb. However, *san ge xingqi* "three weeks", *yi ge yue* "one month" and *san ge zhongtou* "three hours" are not Time Words but phrases that denote temporal duration. These **must** [emphasis added] follow the verb in a sentence (p. 54).

Although the division between "time words" and "temporal duration" is important, Ko fails to explain why "time words" **tend to** (not 'must' as Ko stated) appear before the verb while "temporal duration" tends to follow the verb in a sentence. Moreover, not all "temporal duration" expressions follow the verb. For example, in (17) below *yi ge xingqi* "one week" is a temporal duration, but it is positioned before the verb *xue* "learn":

(17) 她 一 个 星期 学 钢琴, 一 个 星期 学 画 画。
Ta yi ge xingqi xue gangqin, yi ge xingqi xue hua hua.
She one week learn piano, one week learn drawing
She learns piano for a week and learns drawing for another week.

Ko's statement that temporal duration "must follow the verb in a sentence" (p. 54) is too absolute. Exceptions are not hard to find. The function of a temporal duration is responsible for its position in a sentence. This point is elaborated on page 115 of this chapter.

As for Place Words, Ko maintains that "Like Chinese Time Words, Place Words also give the location of an event, and thus **must** [emphasis added] precede the verb in a sentence" (p. 55). Actually counterexamples to this statement abound in Chinese because many Place Words can follow, rather than precede, a verb. Example (18) demonstrates this point:

(18) 大伟 住在 美国。
Dawei zhuzai Meiguo.
David live America.
David lives in America.

Meiguo "America" in (18) is a Place Word and it follows, rather than precedes, the verb *zhuzai* (live). Again example (18) shows the inadequacy of Ko's explanation in regard to the position of Place Word.

In sum, Ko's first category, namely Time and Place Words, indicates that learners had problems with the word order of Time and Place expressions. Yet her explanation of this category is problematic. In addition, this category does not address how to arrange the word order when Time and Place words co-occur, or when more than one Time or Place word co-occur in one sentence. Thus, a more informative categorization is called for.

Category 2: Modification Structures

Under this category, Ko places only modifier + noun (N) structures. As she explains:

> In Chinese, an element that occurs before a noun in a noun phrase and its modifying phrase is considered a modifier.... the particle de is used between a modifier and a noun; the modifier plus de structure precedes the noun. Modifiers can be other nouns, pronouns, adjectives, or whole clauses (p. 57).

While there is nothing wrong with the above description, this category is too limited in that it excludes all the modification structures that involve modifiers (apart from time and place words) and verbs. In fact, a careful examination of the word order errors in the miscellaneous category shows that 19 out of the 47 word order errors are structures involving verbs and their modifiers. For example, (19) below is taken from Ko's miscellaneous category (No. 37, p. 146 in Appendix D):

(19a) *不要 做 这么样。
Buyao zuo zhemeyang.
Not want do this way
Don't do (it) this way.

(19b) 不要 这么样 做。
Buyao zhemeyang zuo.
Not want this way do
Don't do (it) this way.

In (19) above, *zuo* 'do' is a verb and *zhemeyang* 'this way' is an adverbial modifier to modify *zuo*. Therefore, (19) is also a Modification Struc-

ture. However, all the modification structures like (19) involving modifiers and verbs are excluded from Ko's classification. Moreover, similar to the first category, this category is also limited in that it does not indicate how to arrange the word order of modifiers when more than one occur.

Category 3: Topic-comment Relations

Since Chinese is classified as a *topic-prominent* rather than a *subject-prominent* language, the basic sentence structures in Chinese can be more insightfully described in terms of the *topic-comment* relation than in terms of the *subject-predicate* relation (Li & Thompson, 1981). Based on this notion, it is not surprising that word order errors occur if CFL learners apply English *subject-predicate* conceptualizations to those sentences that conventionally employ *topic-comment* structures in Chinese.

However, when Ko applies this notion in categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors, some topic-comment relations are excluded from this category. For instance, the following typical topic-comment structure, found in the miscellaneous category, is excluded (No. 14, p. 141 in Appendix D). It is a response to the question "*Ni hui jiang Guangdong hua ma*?"

(20) #a. 我 讲 广东话 比较 好。
b. *Wo jiang Guangdonghua bijiao hao.*
c. I speak Cantonese relatively good
d. I am better at speaking Cantonese.

e. 广东话 我 讲 得 比较 好。
f. *Guangdonghua wo jiang de bijiao hao.*
g. Cantonese I speak relatively better.
↑ ↑ ↑ ↑
Topic + Comment (Subject Verb Complement)

Hitherto Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy has been evaluated. This taxonomy is limited due to two reasons: (1) the high percentage of the miscellaneous category (35%); and (2) the problematic explanation. The problematic explanation in part arises from failure of acknowledging PTS and WBP. Nevertheless, Ko's taxonomy still provides some important elements for developing a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. Such elements so far identified are summarized in the following sub-section.

2.3. Starting point for a comprehensive Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy

The starting point for a comprehensive Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy is based on the findings from studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition and Chinese word order errors. Section 3.1 has reviewed four studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition. Among them, three involve word order errors. Yu (1986) identified two types of word order errors, namely, noun + adjective (N-A) and verb + adverb (V-Adv). Hu (1992) identified one type of word order error, namely, word order errors due to contextual inappropriateness. Li (1999) proposed an error taxonomy based on whether the word order of a sentence was English or Chinese order. However, Li's (1999) taxonomy is not further explored due to its inconsistency with interlanguage theory and its narrow application range in practice. From the EA studies on Chinese L2, Ko's (1997) word order error taxonomy, as shown in Table 3.4 (p. 72), is considered to provide a basis for a comprehensive taxonomy to be developed. The starting point for establishing an empirically based Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy is presented in Table 3.5, combining all the findings so far reviewed.

Table 3.5 Starting point for establishing taxonomy of word order errors

Category	**Sub-category**
Time and Place Words	
Modification Structures	Noun + adjective Verb + adverb
Topic-comment Relations	
Inappropriateness	(13) B: *# Ni dao dui de difang lai le.* (14) A2: *# Suoyi, xianzai wo you jia zai Foluolida.* (15) B: *# Wo zai Hongzhou yao jiehun.*
Miscellaneous	

Since the two Chinese word order principles, namely PTS and WBP (see pp. 48–54), govern Chinese word order and its variations, they should prove valuable for explaining why the different Chinese L2 word order errors listed in Table 3.5 occurred. The following section examines whether this is the case.

3. Explanatory value of PTS and WBP for Chinese L2 word order errors

Table 3.5 above presents the starting point for establishing an empirically based Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy. The categories and sub-categories will now be examined in relation to the two word order principles, PTS and WBP. As discussed in Chapter Two (section 4.2, pp. 48–54), PTS organizes linguistic structures in such a way that the order of linguistic elements follows the sequence of the temporal order of states or situations that they represent. This principle requires that what happens earlier precede what happens later. WBP concerns 'scope'. It requires that a larger scope precede a smaller scope in terms of space, time and amount, amongst others. The larger scope is considered as 'Whole' while the smaller scope is considered as 'Part', hence Whole-Before-Part (WBP) word order is observed in Chinese. In what follows, the explanatory value of PTS and WBP is examined according to each of the categories and sub-categories of word order errors listed in Table 3.5.

3.1. Time and Place Words

Careful examination of the 48 word order errors in this category (Ko, 1997, p. 119–128) shows that they can be classified into two subcategories: (1) Type A involves the relationship of one Time or Place word with the verb in a sentence; and (2) Type B involves the relationship of two Time words or two Place words. Type A word order errors violate PTS and Type B word order errors violate WBP. Examples (21) and (22) cited from Ko's (1997) word order error nos. 1 and 2 (see her appendix, p. 119) demonstrate Type A errors while (23) and (24) cited from Ko's word order error nos. 40 and 41 (see her appendix, p. 128) demonstrate Type B errors.

Type A errors violate PTS:

In (21), the relationship between Time word *qunian* 'last year' and verb *jiehun* 'marry' is that *qunian* represents a temporal state existing before the action *jiehun* occurred. In this case, PTS requires that *qunian* precede *jiehun* as shown in (21b). (21a) violates PTS and that is why it constitutes a word order error.

(21a) *他们 结婚 **去年**。
Tamen jiehun qunian.
They marry last year
They married last year.

(21b) 他们 **去年** 结婚。
Tamen qunian jiehun.
They last year marry
They married last year.

In (22), the relationship between Place word [hereafter Place expression][7] *zai tushuguan* 'at library' and verb *kanshu* 'to read' is that *zai tushuguan* represents an earlier temporal state than *kanshu* does because one needs to be in the library first before s/he starts reading there. In this case, PTS requires that *zai tushuguan* precede *kanshu,* as shown in (22b). Similar to (21a), (22a) constitutes a word order error because it also violates PTS.

(22a) *屋子 太 小 了, 所以 我 喜欢 看书 **在 图书馆**。
*Wuzi tai xiao le, suoyi wo xihuan kanshu **zai tushuguan**.*
The room too small, therefore I like reading at library
The room is too small, therefore I like to read in the library.

(22b) 屋子 太 小 了, 所以 我 喜欢 **在 图书馆** 看书。
*Wuzi tai xiao le, suoyi wo xihuan **zai tushuguan** kanshu.*
The room too small, therefore I like at library reading
The room is too small, therefore I like to read in the library.

Type B errors violate WBP:

In (23), the relationship between the two Time expressions *liangdian* 'two o'clock' and *xiawu* 'afternoon' is that the temporal scope of *liangdian* comprises part of the temporal scope of *xiawu*. In this case, WBP requires that *liangdian* follow *xiawu,* as shown in (23b). (23a) violates WBP and that is why it is erroneous.

(23a) *我 每天 上课 上 到 **两点** **下午**。
*Wo meitian shangke shang dao **liangdian xiawu**.*
I every day have classes have until two o'clock afternoon
Every day I have classes until two o'clock in the afternoon.

7. The so-called 'Time word' or 'Place word' referred to by Ko (1997) sometimes is not one word. Instead, it is a phrase. 'Expression' is used to replace 'word' hereafter.

(23b) 我 每天 上课 上 到 **下午 两点**。
*Wo meitian shangke shang dao **xiawu liangdian**.*
I every day have classes have until afternoon two o'clock
Every day I have classes until two o'clock in the afternoon.

In (24), the relationship between the two Place expressions *xinli xi* 'School of Psychology' and *daxue* 'University' is that the spatial or institutional scope of *xinli xi* comprises part of the spatial or institutional scope of *daxue*. In this case, WBP requires that *xinli xi* follow *daxue,* as shown in (24b). Similar to (23a), (24a) violates WBP and that is why it is erroneous as well.

(24a) *我 工作 在 **心理 系 大学**。
*Wo gongzuo zai **xinli xi daxue**.*
I work at School of Psychology University.
I work at the School of Psychology in the university.

(24b) 我 在 **大学 心理 系** 工作。
*Wo zai **daxue xinli xi** gongzuo.*
I at university School of Psychology work.
I work at the School of Psychology in the university.

3.2. Modification Structures

This category of word order errors includes the noun + adjective type and verb + adverb type, as shown in Table 3.5. Although the noun + adjective type violates neither PTS nor WBP, the verb + adverb type is found to violate PTS. Example (25a) below demonstrates this violation. In (25), the relationship between the verb *shuijiao* 'go to bed' and the adverb *zao yi dian* 'a bit early' is that the manner *zao yi dian* is decided before the action *shuijiao* takes place. In this case, PTS requires that *zao yi dian* precede *shuijiao* as shown in (25b). (25a) is an error because it violates PTS.

(25a) *明天 考试, 他 要 睡觉 **早 一 点**。
*Mingtian kaoshi, ta yao shuijiao **zao yi dian**.*
Tomorrow exam, he want go to bed early a bit
He has exam tomorrow, so he wants to go to bed a bit early.

(25b) 明天　　考试，他要 **早 一点** 睡觉。
*Mingtian kaoshi, ta yao **zao yi dian** shuijiao.*
Tomorrow exam, he want early a bit go to bed
He has an exam tomorrow, so he wants to go to bed a bit early.

The noun + adjective type of word order error violates neither PTS nor WBP. This suggests that PTS and WBP are not the only word order principles that govern Chinese word order and its variations.

3.3. Topic-comment Relations

Topic-comment Relations is a word order error category that concerns the word order arrangement of a Chinese topic-comment structure. Neither PTS nor WBP has been found to directly explain why this category of word order errors occurs. This also suggests that other underlying Chinese word order principle or principles are in effect, and, as such, needs to be further explored.

3.4. Inappropriateness

As discussed in section 1.3 (see p. 63), word order is one of the important cohesive devices for developing coherent discourse in Chinese. Misuse of word order in certain contexts may cause word order errors due to inappropriateness rather than ungrammaticality. PTS explains all these errors shown in (13)B, (14)A2 and (15)B, demonstrating its value in explaining Chinese word order errors. Examples (13), (14) and (15) are presented here again for the sake of convenience.

(13) A: *Wo yao mai dao Bali de piao.*
B: *# Ni dao dui de difang lai le.*

(14) A1: *Wo de jia li zher yuan.*
A2: *# Suoyi, xianzai wo you jia zai Foluolida.*

(15) A: *Ni yao zai shenme difang jiehun?*
B: *# Wo zai Hongzhou yao jiehun.*

In (13) B the action of *lai* 'come' had taken place before the comment *dui* 'right' was made. In this case, PTS requires that *lai* precede *dui*. However, in (13) B, *lai* follows *dui*, which violates PTS. That is why (13) B is regarded as erroneous.

In (14) the Place expression *zai Foluolida* 'in Florida' represents a temporal state that happens earlier than the verb phrase *you jia* 'have a home'. In other words, the agent *wo* in (14) had been in Florida already before s/he had a home there. In this case, PTS requires that *zai Foluolida* precede *you jia*. However, in (14) A2, *zai Foluolida* follows *you jia*, which violates PTS. This explains why (14) A2 is also erroneous.

In (15) the appropriate way to answer the question *Ni yao zai* ***shenme difang*** *jiehun*? is to use the place name *Hangzhou* to replace *shenme defang*, as in *Wo yao zai Hangzhou jiehun*. Since *yao zai* has been mentioned in the question, PTS requires that both *yao* and *zai* precede *Hangzhou* in the answer. However, in (15) B, *yao* follows *Hangzhou*, which violates PTS, thus making it inappropriate in this context.

As demonstrated above, the two word order principles, PTS and WBP, can explain not only word order errors due to ungrammaticality but also those due to inappropriateness. Given that they can explain how most of the word order errors (three out of four categories) listed in Table 3.5 occurred, the importance of the two word order principles has been established. At the same time, the word order error category of *Topic-comment Relations* does not involve either PTS or WBP and the category of *Modification Structures* has been only partially explained, suggesting that other word order principles also exist. It is thus necessary to review the underlying Chinese word order principles more systematically in order to explicitly identify other word order principles in addition to PTS and WBP. In so doing, a better understanding of the functioning of Chinese word order can be achieved. Such a systematic review of word order principles will contribute to the understanding of Chinese L2 word order errors and, in turn, to the description and explanation of these errors.

4. Underlying principles governing word order and its variations in Chinese

This section consists of three sub-sections. The first sub-section introduces ways of investigating Chinese word order principles. The second sub-section reviews and categorizes different word order principles and sub-principles that emerge from the literature. The third sub-section demonstrates with examples how each of the principles and sub-principles functions in governing Chinese word order.

4.1. Introduction

Due to its lack of inflectional morphology, Chinese relies heavily on word order to indicate the relations between constituents of a sentence and a discourse. For a long time, great effort has been made in uncovering the principles governing word order in Chinese. Early in the 1950s, Chinese grammarians started a heated debate about the grammatical meanings of "subject" and "object" in relation to the order of Chinese syntactic patterns (Lü, 1956). In the United States, Chinese word order has also been extensively discussed in terms of either Greenberg's typological universals (Chu, 1984; Li & Thompson, 1974; Light, 1979; Mei, 1980; Sun & Givón, 1985; Tai, 1973), or in terms of the phrase structure principles of Universal Grammar and their parameterization in Chinese (Huang, 1982; Li, 1990). Chao (1968) and Li and Thompson (1976, 1981) contributed to Chinese word order research by identifying the topic-comment relation in a large number of Chinese sentences (see p. 10). According to Hu (1995), the scope of earlier studies is confined to the language-internal system itself. The language-external motivating factors for the formation of Chinese word order patterns, such as iconicity in PTS, have received more attention only after Tai's work in 1985 and 1989.

4.2. Word order principles

The literature on word order is extensive, but of specific relevance to the present project is Mathesius' (1975) and Firbas' (1992) view that word order is a system constituted by the mutual relations of word order principles. Mathesius was the first functionalist to view word order in such a way. He summarized the following five word order principles (1975):

(1) The principle of grammatical function
(2) The principle of coherence of members
(3) The principle of functional sentence perspective (FSP)
(4) The principle of emphasis
(5) The principle of sentence rhythm

According to Firbas (1992), the principle of grammatical function (1) manifests itself whereby the sentence position of an element is determined by its syntactic function. In accordance with this principle, English positions the subject before the predicate verb and the latter

before the object, presenting a SVO order. The principle of coherence of members (2) requires that the contiguous members of a sentence be coherent. The principle of functional sentence perspective (FSP) (3) requires that sentence elements be arranged in a Theme-Transition-Rheme sequence in terms of communication flow. The principle of emphasis (4) orders words in a way that strikes recipients as more or less out of the ordinary. Finally, the principle of sentence rhythm (5) enables a certain pattern of heavy and light elements, which are respectively stressed and unstressed in the spoken language.

Following Mathesius, Firbas (1992) merges the principle of grammatical function (1) and the principle of coherence of members (2) into one principle, named the grammatical principle. He also introduces the notion of communicative dynamism (CD) (elaborated later in this section, see p. 97) and modifies Mathesius' third principle, namely the principle of FSP, establishing the FSP linearity principle. As a result, Firbas' (1992) revised principles are as follows:

(1) The grammatical principle
(2) The FSP linearity principle
(3) The principle of emphasis
(4) The principle of sentence rhythm

Firbas (1992) convincingly shows that, among the four word order principles, the grammatical principle is the most important in English while in Czech the most important one is the FSP linearity principle. So, these principles vary in their importance in different languages.

Following Mathesius and Firbas, and inspired by Haiman (1983, 1985a, 1985b), Tai (1985, 1989a, 1993) identified word order principles in Chinese. He considered the following to be the most important principles governing Chinese word order:

(1) Principle of Temporal Sequence
(2) Principle of Temporal Scope
(3) Whole-Before-Part
(4) Container-Before-Contained
(5) Trajector-Landmark
(6) Modifier-Before-Head

Hu (1995), combining, for the most part, Firbas' (1992) word order principles governing Indo-European languages like English and Tai's (1985, 1989a, 1993) work on Chinese word order principles, categorizes Chinese word order principles into three domains as shown in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6 Hu's (1995) categorization of Chinese word order principles

Domain	Principle
Conceptual	1. Principle of Temporal Sequence 2. Principle of Temporal Scope 3. Whole-Before-Part 4. Container-Before-Contained 5. Trajector-Landmark
Functional	6. Principle of Communicative Dynamism 7. Principle of FSP 8. Principle of Perspective Taking 9. Principle of Focus 10. Principle of Coherence and Relevance
Grammatical	11. Modifier-Before-Head

Among the 11 principles in Table 3.6, nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11 are from Tai and nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are from Mathesius and Firbas, with slight change of wording to cater for the Chinese language. Careful examination of all these principles summarized by Hu (1995) shows:

(1) Principle 2 actually is a sub-principle of 3, as stated in Hu (1995), "closely related to the Principle of Temporal Scope is the more general principle of Whole-Before-Part" (p. 27).
(2) Principles 6 and 7 can actually be condensed into one principle, since they both require that word order in a sentence be arranged in accordance with a gradual rise in Communicative Dynamism (for elaboration, see p. 97). The condensed principle is named the Principle of Communicative Dynamism (PCD) in this study, given that more researchers in Chinese linguistic studies employ the term Communicative Dynamism.
(3) Principles 8 and 10 are particularly relevant to a speaker's attitude and immediate context in spoken language. As the present study is designed to investigate word order errors in written Chinese, these two principles can be excluded from consideration here.
(4) The principle of emphasis and the principle of sentence rhythm identified in Mathesius (1962, in Firbas, 1992) and Firbas (1992) can only be studied with oral data, which is beyond the scope of this study. They are also excluded in both Tai's and Hu's categories of principles.

Taking these points into consideration, the number of principles in Hu's categorization is reduced from eleven to seven, as shown in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7 Chinese word order principles revised from Hu's categorization

Domain	**Principle**	**Sub-principle**
Conceptual	1. Principle of Temporal Sequence 2. Whole-Before-Part 3. Container-Before-Contained 4. Trajector-Landmark	Temporal Scope
Functional	5. Principle of Communicative Dynamism 6. Principle of Focus	
Grammatical	7. Modifier-Before-Head	

Unlike Hu (1995) who investigated the functional perspective of Chinese word order by identifying three domains of word order principles, Ho (1993) has studied Chinese discourse structure from three perspectives: 1) thematic structure, 2) information structure and 3) word order. In the word order perspective, his empirical oral data shows that some syntactic phenomena of Chinese discourse structure are controlled by non-syntactic forces. These non-syntactic forces include cognitive processes reflected in three word order principles. They are the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS), the Principle of General Preceding Particular, and the Empathetic Principle (EP). Moreover, he particularizes PTS into six sub-principles. The principles and sub-principles are summarized in Table 3.8 below.

Table 3.8 Ho's (1993) further classification of some Chinese word order principles

Principle	**Sub-principle**
Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS)	1. Action Series 2. Locative Expressions 3. Time Expressions 4. Beneficiary/the Concerned 5. Modifiers of the Verb 6. Subsidiary Relations
Principle of General Preceding Particular	
Empathetic Principle (EP)	

Ho's (1993) second principle, namely the Principle of General Preceding Particular, is actually a different name for the Whole-Before-Part principle. As stated by Ho (1993), "A second principle that governs the word order in Chinese may be characterized as the general-particular or the whole-part ordering" (p. 165).

Combining Table 3.7 and 3.8 produces Table 3.9 below, which summarizes word order principles and sub-principles so far identified governing written Chinese word order.

Table 3.9 Summary of Chinese word order principles and sub-principles

Domain	**Principle**	**Sub-principle**
Conceptual	1. Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS)	1.1 Action Series 1.2 Locative Expressions 1.3 Time Expressions 1.4 the Beneficiary 1.5 Modifiers of the Verb 1.6 Subsidiary Relations
	2. Whole-Before-Part (WBP)	2.1 Temporal Scope
	3. Container-Before-Contained (CBC)	
	4. Trajector-Landmark (TL)	
Functional	5. Principle of Communicative Dynamism (PCD)	
	6. Principle of Focus (PF)	
Grammatical	7. Modifier-Before-Head (MBH)	
	8. Empathetic Principle (EP)*	

*As EP was not identified by Hu (1995), it has no corresponding domain categorization.

In order to show how these principles govern Chinese word order, the following sub-section demonstrates with examples each of the word order principles and sub-principles.

4.3. Demonstration of Chinese word order principles and sub-principles

The Chinese word order principles and sub-principles listed in Table 3.9 are explained and demonstrated below with examples. For the sake of convenience, each will be referred to by the number preceding it.

4.3.1. Conceptual principles

Following Koffka (1935), Hu (1995) maintains that human beings behave and interact in a *behavioural environment* (p. 26) that may not be identical to the physical world, or a *geographical environment* (p. 26). The behavioural environment is what the environment looks or appears like to us. Due to different socio-cultural experiences, people speaking different languages may have different conceptions of the physical world. Those conceptual differences in turn contribute to the unique characteristics of their linguistic behaviours, which are reflected in the underlying principles regulating language use. Both Langacker (1987) and Tai (1989a) propose that a natural language system itself is a symbolization of the conceptualized world, by which they maintain that language is governed by *conceptual* principles.

The Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) (1)

As discussed in the review of the core areas of Cognitive Functionalist Grammar (see Chapter Two, p. 48), Tai (1985) has singled out several important iconic motivations in Chinese grammar. One of them is order motivation, which means the order of linguistic expressions corresponds to their order in the conceptual world. The principle expressing iconicity in Chinese word order is named the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS), which has been frequently mentioned in explaining the word order errors listed in Table 3.5 (p. 76). PTS manifests itself in that "The relative word order between syntactic units is determined by the temporal order of the states that they represent in the conceptual world" (Tai, 1985, p. 50). In order to demonstrate PTS, examples (26) and (27) are cited here from Hu (1995) (with some changes in the English translations).

(26) 他 坐 车 到 这儿。
Ta zuo che dao zher.
He sit bus arrive here
He came here by bus.

(27) 他 到 这儿 坐 车。
Ta dao zher zuo che.
He arrive here sit bus
He came here to take a bus (p. 8).

Sentences (26) and (27) comprise exactly the same constituents and only differ in word order. PTS requires what happens earlier to precede what happens later. In (26) *zuo che* 'taking a bus' precedes *dao zher* 'arriving here', which indicates that the action of 'taking a bus' occurs before the action of 'arriving here'. Sentence (27) indicates the reverse temporal order because *dao zher* precedes *zuo che*, which means that his "arriving here" occurs before his "taking a bus", so he must be going somewhere else. The rearrangement of word order signals tremendous meaning change, as shown in the English translations. With respect to the meaning of each sentence, one cannot change its respective word order and still convey the same meaning.

Skilful use of this principle in arranging word order in sentences can convey the speaker/writer's wisdom and eloquence. The following example will demonstrate this vividly. A story, which satirizes waiters in restaurants treating customers differently according to customers' appearances, is told as follows:

> One day, a well-dressed customer entered a restaurant and asked: "有什么可以吃的? (What food do you have)?" A waiter replied with a big smile: "吃什么有什么 (We'll have whatever you want to eat)!" Later on, a poorly-dressed customer entered the same restaurant and asked the same question: "有什么可以吃的? (What food do you have)?" The same waiter replied coldly: "有什么吃什么 (You'll have to eat what we have)!".

The order change of only two Chinese characters 有 *you* (have) and 吃 *chi* (eat) has changed the meaning completely. The temporal sequence of *you* and *chi,* namely which comes first, thus plays a critical role in the following two sentences:

(28) **吃** 什么 **有** 什么!
Chi shenme you shenme!
Eat what have what
(we'll) have whatever you want to eat!

(29) **有** 什么 **吃** 什么!
You shenme chi shenme!
Have what eat what
(you'll) have to eat what we have!

(28) is indicating "We'll make an extra effort to satisfy/please you" while (29) is saying the opposite "We don't have to make any extra effort to satisfy/please you". The waiter expresses his different attitudes

towards the two customers by changing the word order of only two characters. Such a meaning difference between (28) and (29) arising from the different ordering sequences of the two verbs 有 *you* (have) and 吃 *chi* (eat) demonstrates the power of PTS.

Tai (1985) claims that PTS has an independent motivation and great explanatory value in Chinese grammar. He states that, "It [PTS] subsumes under one general principle a large number of word order rules hitherto regarded as unrelated. It governs the word order behaviours of the majority of the syntactic categories definable in this language" (p. 63). Ho (1993) particularizes PTS into six sub-principles and this provides more specific explanations for Chinese word order phenomena. These six sub-principles are 1.1 Action Series, 1.2 Locative Expressions, 1.3 Time Expressions, 1.4 Beneficiary/the Concerned, 1.5 Modifiers of the Verb and 1.6 Subsidiary Relations, as indicated in Table 3.9 (p. 86). These are discussed below.

Action Series sub-principle (1.1)

This sub-principle prescribes that "action series" strictly follow PTS, which means that if there are two or more actions in a Chinese phrase or sentence, the action that happens earlier precedes the one that happens later. Ho (1993) demonstrates this sub-principle with many examples. Verb compounds are good examples for illustrating this point (Ho, 1993, p. 145):

> *Da si* (beat die), *kan dong* (see understand), *xi ganjing* (wash clean), *chi wan* (eat finish), *pi dao* (split fall), *nong huai* (make break)

In each of the above compounds, the first action occurs earlier than the second, and the second action is the result of the first action. The reverse order would not make any sense in Chinese. However, many other "action series" can have a reverse word order, although resulting in a different meaning. For example, the meanings of *kai che qu* 'go by car' and *qu kai che* 'go to get a car' are very different, as shown in the English translations.

This sub-principle provides a more specific and clearer explanation for the word order error in (13) B, as explained on page 80.

Locative Expressions sub-principle (1.2)

Locative expressions refer to phrases that indicate a place or a space. They are usually formed by "a preposition, such as *zai* (in, at, on), *cong*

(from), *wang* (towards), a noun and a localizer" (Ho, 1993, p. 149). Localizers, according to Ho (1993), are also referred to as prepositions, which include *shang* (up), *xia* (down), *li* (in), *wai* (out), *limian* (inside) and so on. The equivalent Chinese for "on the table" is *zai zhuozi shang* (on table up), rather than *zai zhuozi* (on table).

This sub-principle, according to Ho (1993), stipulates that locative expressions can occur both pre-verbally and post-verbally, depending on their temporal and perceptual relation with the verb. A locative expression precedes a verb if the locality referred to by the locative expression exists before the action of the verb and provides a location for the action denoted by the verb to happen. A locative expression follows a verb if the locality is a result of the action denoted by the verb. Examples (30) and (31), quoted from Ho (1993, p. 150), demonstrate the relationships between the locative expression and the verb.

(30) 猫 在 桌子 上 跳。
Mao zai zhuozi shang tiao.
Cat on table up jump
The cat is jumping around on the table.

(31) 猫 跳 在 桌子 上。
Mao tiao zai zhuozi shang.
Cat jump on table up
The cat has jumped onto the table.

(30) and (31) comprise exactly the same constituents and only differ in the word order of the locative expression and the verb. So, the meaning difference between the two sentences is a result of different word order arrangements. In (30) the locative expression *zai zhuozi shang* 'on the table' is placed in a pre-verbal position, so it provides a location for the action *tiao* 'jump' to take place, which indicates that the cat had been on the table before it started jumping around there. In (31) the locative expression *zai zhuozi shang* 'on the table' is placed in a post-verbal position, so it refers to the location that is a result of the action *tiao* 'jump', which indicates that the cat jumped from somewhere else and landed on the table.

This sub-principle provides a more specific explanation for word order errors (14) A2 and (15) B (see p. 81).

Time Expressions sub-principle (1.3)

Similar to locative expressions, time expressions can occur syntactically either before a V (verb) or after a V, as determined by their temporal relations with the verb. According to Ho (1993), when a time expression represents a temporal state that happens earlier than the action denoted by the verb to happen, it occurs before V, and when a time expression is actually the result of the action denoted by V, it occurs after V. "Punctual time", such as *wanshang qidian* (7 pm), needs to be differentiated from "temporal duration", such as *san nian* (three years), because the former often represents a temporal state that happens earlier than an action or marks the beginning of an action, while the latter is often the result of the action denoted by the verb. Examples (32) and (33) demonstrate the difference between "punctual time" and "temporal duration" and their respective positions in the sentences according to their relations with the verb.

(32) 我 晚上 七点 上 课。
Wo wanshang qidian shang ke.
I evening 7 o'clock have class
I have class at 7.00 in the evening.

(33) 我 学习 汉语 三 年 了。
Wo xuexi hanyu san nian le.
I study Chinese three years
I have studied Chinese for three years.

In (32), *wanshang qi dian* (7 pm) offers the starting point for the verb *shang ke* (have class) while in (33) *san nian* (three years) is the result of the verb *xuexi* (study), which has lasted for three years. That is why *wanshang qi dian* precedes the verb *shang ke* (have class) in (32) while *san nian* (three years) has to follow the verb *xuexi* (study) in (33).

That punctual time precedes V and temporal duration follows V, however, is not absolute. Temporal duration can precede the V if the action of the verb represents a temporal state that is resulted from working during the time period mentioned. The sentence *San ge xingqi li wo xie le yi ben shu* 'I have written a book within three weeks' can be well explained by this sub-principle, that is, when *xie le yi ben shu* 'wrote a book' is a result of working during the "temporal duration" *san*

ge xingqi li (within three weeks), it has to be positioned after, rather than before, the temporal duration.

Beneficiary/the Concerned sub-principle (1.4)

The term *Beneficiary/the Concerned* (B) refers to, "a party, usually a person, for whom a service is performed or an act is intended" (Ho, 1993, p. 158). Ho (1993) further explains:

> Logically, it seems that the sequence should be V + B, since the beneficiary/the concerned party benefits or bears the impact of an action, but in fact the beneficiary/the concerned is conceived before the service is rendered or an act performed. For, without the beneficiary/the concerned being conceived in the first place, there would not be the whole act. That is why the sequence of these two elements is B + V (p. 158).

The most natural word order for the beneficiary and the act in Chinese requires that the beneficiary precede the act. Moreover, the beneficiary often follows prepositions such as *dui* (to), *gei* (for), *xiang* (towards) and so on. Examples (34) and (35) demonstrate this word order:

(34) 我 **给 妹妹** 买 了 一 块 手表。
*Wo **gei meimei** mai le yi kuai shoubiao.*
I for younger sister buy LE one watch
I have bought a watch for my sister.

(35) 请 **向** **他** 问 好!
*Qing **xiang ta** wen hao!*
Please towards him say hello
Please say hello to him for me.

In (34), *meimei* (younger sister) is the beneficiary and it precedes the act *mai le yi kuai shoubiao* (buy a watch) since, without firstly thinking of the younger sister, the act of buying a watch would not have happened. Similarly in (35), *ta* (he) is the beneficiary and it precedes the act of *wen hao* (say hello). One usually thinks of the person first before requesting others to say hello to him/her on one's behalf.

Modifiers of the Verb sub-principle (1.5)

In Chinese, modifiers of the verb are classified into two major categories using word order as the sole criterion. As Ho (1993) states, "pre-verbal modifiers (MV) are called adverbials, [while] post-verbal

modifiers (VM) are called complements" (p. 162). In the former, M is followed by *de* (地, adverbial indicator) and in the latter M is preceded by *de* (得, complement indicator). A semantic distinction exists between MV and VM. M in the MV sequence denotes the manner of the verb, which the agent knows or decides before the action of the verb, while M in the VM sequence denotes a condition that results from the action of the verb. When using the same M and V, a change in word order will change the meaning of a sentence, as illustrated by the following examples.

(36) 他 很 开心 **地** 吃。
Ta hen kaixin de chi.
He very happy *de* eat
He is happily eating.

(37) 他 吃 **得** 很 开心。
Ta chi de hen kaixin.
He eat *de* very happy
He became happy by eating.

The M in both (36) and (37) is *hen kaixin* (very happy) and the verb in both (36) and (37) is *chi* (eat). MV sequence, as shown in (36), means that he is happy before he starts eating while VM sequence, as shown in (37), means that he becomes happy because of eating or after eating. The adverbial shows how the action denoted by the verb starts and hence precedes the verb, while the complement is a comment on the result of a verb and hence follows the verb. The subtlety of meaning difference between (36) and (37) cannot be fully understood by L2 learners without referring to the Modifiers of the Verb sub-principle.

This sub-principle also provides a more specific explanation for the word order error sub-category Verb + adverb under Ko's (1997) category of *Modification Structures,* as shown in Table 3.5 on page 76.

Subsidiary Relations sub-principle (1.6)

This sub-principle refers to the unmarked sequence in Chinese where subordinate clauses precede principal clauses. In subordinate clauses, according to Ho (1993), one often finds relations of condition, concession, cause, manner, means, exclusion, accompaniment or comparison. These clauses precede the main clauses in Chinese because they are usually conceptually earlier than the main clauses. As Ho (1993) argues, "This order finds an effective explanation in the PTS in that they are conceptually earlier in time, serving as the point of departure or the precondi-

tion for the event or circumstances of the event presented in the principal clause" (p. 159). Examples (38) and (39) show this word order:

(38) 因为 没 有 钱, 所以 我 不 能 去 旅 游。
Yinwei mei you qian, suoyi wo bu neng qu lü you.
Because not have money, therefore I not can go travel.
I cannot go travelling because I don't have money.

(39) 只 要 你 努力, 你 就 能 学 好 中文。
Zhi yao ni nuli, ni jiu neng xue hao zhongwen.
If you study hard, you then can learn well Chinese
You will learn Chinese well if you study hard.

In (38), the subordinate clause states the reason *mei you qian* (not have money) for not being able to carry out the wish of *qu lüyou* (go travelling). In (39), the subordinate clause is a condition *nuli* (study hard) to achieve the result *xue hao zhongwen* (learn Chinese well) stated in the main clause. In Chinese, the word order where subordinate clauses precede their principal clauses are unmarked forms. The reversed order often requires a reason, such as for the purpose of emphasis or for other reasons that depend on the context (Ho, 1993).

The Whole-Before-Part principle (WBP) (2)

In Tai (1985, 1989a 1993), it is shown that Chinese word order also tends to follow the Whole-Before-Part schema, as discussed earlier in Chapter Two (see page 48). Specifically, in Ho's (1993) words, "it means that constituents representing a global scope (general or whole) should precede those that represent a smaller scope (particular or specific)" (p. 165). This principle is very important in expressing a relationship between two constituents whereby one falls within the scope of the other. In example (40), the single underlined part shows the "Whole" while the double underlined part shows the "Part" in Chinese, which is in the opposite ordering sequence in English.

(40) 大伟 比 我 高 两 公分。
Dawei bi wo gao liang gongfen.
David compare me tall two centimetre
David is two centimetres taller than I am.

In (40), the concept *gao* 'tall' is much more general than the concept of *liang gongfen* 'two centimetres'. That is why *gao* precedes *liang gongfen* in Chinese.

Temporal Scope sub-principle (2.1)

Temporal Scope sub-principle was identified by Tai (1985) originally as an independent word order principle. Later it has been found to fall within the scope of a more general WBP principle. In Tai's (1985) words, Temporal Scope sub-principle manifests itself in that "if the conceptual state represented by a syntactic unit X falls within the temporal scope of the conceptual state represented by a syntactic unit Y, the word order is YX" (p. 60). This requires that a constituent with smaller temporal range should follow one with larger temporal range.

Example (41) demonstrates this conceptual sub-principle. Starting from the left, each element symbolizes a larger temporal scope entailing a smaller one on its right. This sequential order in Chinese is governed by the underlying sub-principle of Temporal Scope, which is just the opposite ordering in English.

(41) 二零 零 三 年 十一月 二十五日下午四点。
Er ling ling san nian shi yi yue er shi wu ri xia wu si dian.
2003 year November twenty-five date afternoon four clock
at 4.00 p.m. on 25 November 2003.

In sum, examples (40) and (41) demonstrate that Chinese observes WBP principle while English observes Part-Before-Whole principle in arranging word order in time expressions.

Container-Before-Contained principle (CBC) (3)

This principle requires that the word order of the "Container" precede the "Contained" in Chinese, as exemplified by the following sentences in (42) and (43) (Hu, 1995, pp. 9–10). The single underlined part symbolizes the *container*, and the double underlined part symbolizes the *contained*. Interestingly, the unmarked order of the *container* and *contained* is just the opposite in English.

(42) 图书馆 里有 很多书。
Tushuguan li you hen duo shu.
Library inside have many book
There are many books in the library.

(43) 屋里坐着 一个人。
Wu li zuo zhe yi ge ren.
Room inside sit ASP one M person
There is a person sitting in the room.

Hu (1995) further says that for the same physical reality in example (42), namely "many books in the library," the preferred responses from English-speaking people and Chinese speaking people in their verbal descriptions are different, though alternative patterns are available in both languages. In English, the two patterns corresponding to this situation are:

(44) There are many books in the library.

(45) The library has many books.

In Chinese, the two patterns are:

(46) 有 很多 书 在 图书馆 里。
You henduo shu zai tushuguan li.
Have many book exist library inside
There are many books in the library.

(47) 图书馆 里 有 很 多 书。
Tushuguan li you hen duo shu.
Library inside have many book
The library has many books (Hu, 1995, p. 10).

In English, the preferred pattern is (44), while in Chinese, it is (47). These preferences in the two languages should find an explanation in the Container-Before-Contained principle in Chinese and the Contained-Before-Container principle in English.

Trajector-Landmark principle (TL) (4)

In Hu's words, the principle of Trajector-Landmark "orders the linguistic element symbolizing the focal point before the element representing the landmark" (p. 43). The following two examples demonstrating this principle are also from Hu (1995, p. 43):

(48) 他 在 图书馆。
Ta zai tushuguan.
He exist book house
He is in the library.

(49) 茶 杯 在 桌子 上。
Cha bei zai zhuozi shang.
Tea cup exist table top
The teacup is in on the table.

In (48), *ta* (he) is the trajector and *tushuguan* (library) is the landmark while in (49) *cha bei* (teacup) is the trajector while *zhuozi shang* (on the table) is the landmark. In both cases, *zai* (to exist) functions to anchor the trajector in a space (landmark). Hu (1995) maintains that the *Trajector-Landmark* relationship represents a different alignment from that presented by Whole/Container-Part/Contained, with the trajector being a focal point to be located in a space in relation to a reference point, landmark.

4.3.2. Functional principles

Functional principles play a significant role in the determination of word order in Chinese (Hu, 1995). The four conceptual principles discussed earlier do not directly relate to communicative intent. This is the focus of functional principles. Phonological devices, such as stress, rising tone, deliberate pause and sentence rhythm, all signal communicative intent. However, they are excluded from consideration here because they are beyond the scope of this study. In what follows, the two most important functional principles, one being *the Principle of Communicative Dynamism* (PCD), and the other *the Principle of Focus* (PF), are reviewed.

The Principle of Communicative Dynamism (PCD) (5)

Firbas' most important contribution to the development of word order principles is his notion of *Communicative Dynamism* (CD) (Zhang, 1994). By CD, Firbas (1992) refers to the extent to which a sentence element contributes to the development of the communication. In Firbas' (1992) words:

> the elements of a clause, independent or dependent, differ in the extent to which they contribute towards the further development of the communication. In the act of communication some elements are more and others less dynamic. This induces me to speak of communicative dynamism (CD), a phenomenon constantly displayed by linguistic elements in the act of communication. It is an inherent quality of communication and manifests itself in constant development towards the attainment of a communicative goal, in other words, towards the fulfillment of a communicative purpose (p. 7).

Firbas (1992) further notes that CD is relative in that the degree of CD carried by an element within a sentence is always determined in relation to the contributions that the other elements within the sentence

make to the further development of the communication. Chen (1995) supports Firbas' finding of the relative nature of CD, and also demonstrates that "the ordering of major elements in a Chinese sentence is determined by the amount of CD they carry. The less CD an element has, the more toward the left it will be positioned" (p. 218).

The Principle of Communicative Dynamism (PCD) in Chinese requires that the sentence element that carries the highest CD positions at the end of a sentence, which is also referred to as the "end focus principle" by Ho (1993) and Zhang (1994). Although PCD is present in all languages in governing the order of sentence elements, languages do not give equal weight to this operative mechanism. For example, Firbas (1992) notes that while PCD is the leading word order principle in Czech, it seems to be only secondary in English. Chen's (1995) empirical data also provides evidence for the claim that PCD is one of the dominating word order principles in Chinese. For example, the highest CD carrier of the natural English sentence "there are too many people here" is "too many"; in Chinese, the highest CD carrier naturally falls to the end, as shown in (50):

(50) 这儿 人 **太 多**。
Zher ren tai duo.
Here people too many
There are **too many** people here (Chao, 1968, p. 79).

Similarly, in "more and more people are studying science", the highest CD carrier "more and more" is positioned at the beginning of the sentence in English, whereas in Chinese, the highest CD carrier is at the end, as shown in (51):

(51) 研究 科学 的 **人 越 来 越 多**。
Yanjiu kexue de ren yue lai yue duo.
Study science *de* people more and more many
More and more people are studying science (Chao, 1968, p. 79).

Ho (1993) notes that such a strict observance of the PCD in Chinese is also one of the important reasons why thematic structure is well developed in the language, since information focus (the highest CD carrier) in any other position except the final disrupts the functional schematization of old information being followed by new information. In addition, as Ho (1993) notes, "the principle of communicative dynamism applies not only at the sentence level, but also at the phrase level" (p. 100). The

two English sentences in (52) and (53) are most naturally expressed in Chinese respectively in (54) and (55):

(52) He has **black** hair.

(53) I had a **sore** arm.

(54) 他 头发 **黑**。
*Ta toufa **hei**.*
He hair black
He has black hair.

(55) 我 胳膊 **疼**。
*Wo gebo **teng**.*
I arm sore
I have a sore arm.

The important difference between English and Chinese lies in the positioning of the highest CD carrier. Pragmatically, the highest CD carriers in the two sentences are "black" and "sore", which appear as modifiers in the sentence-medial position in English, but as predicates, occupying the sentence-final position in Chinese. More examples can be found in Ho (1993) and Chen (1995).

The Principle of Focus (PF) (6)

Before the Principle of Focus (PF) is reviewed, it is necessary to discuss the notion of "focus" since there has been serious confusion in the literature concerning the notion of "focus" in Chinese. Different terms are used in denoting different foci. It is necessary to clarify the notions and to distinguish the terminologies used.

Careful examination shows that *attentional focus* in Hu (1995) refers to the initial position in a sentence. The initial position usually requires more attention of listeners or readers than other positions in a sentence. *Informational focus* in Hu (1995), Roberts (1998) and Xu (2003), *information focus* in Kiss (1998), *natural focus* in Xu and Liu (1997), and *regular focus* in Zhang and Fang (1996) all refer to the same notion of where the new information in communication is located. *Identificational focus* in Kiss (1998), *operational focus* in Roberts (1998), and *contrastive focus* in Xu (2003), Xu and Liu (1997) and Zhang and Fang (1996) all refer to the same notion that the focus is on a contrast of information. Therefore, the above expressions of 'focus' actually refer to three notions, for which this study adopts *attentional focus*, *informational focus* and

contrastive focus because more researchers employ these three terms. They are discussed below:

First, *attentional focus* should be distinguished from *informational focus*. In agreement with Hu's interpretation (1995), this study maintains that *attentional focus* refers to the point attracting the listener's/reader's attention while *informational focus* refers to the point where the intended message lies, namely the highest CD carrier. These two foci are different since the former occupies sentence initial position while the latter occupies sentence final position. Hu (1995) has provided the following two examples to show the difference between them:

(56) 学校　到 了 新 老师。
Xuexiao dao le xin laoshi.
School arrive LE new teacher
A new teacher came to the school.

(57) 新 老师 到 了 学校。
Xin laoshi dao le xuexiao.
New teacher arrive LE school
The new teacher came to the school (p. 83).

Xuexiao (the school) in (56) is the *attentional focus*, whereas *xin laoshi* (a new teacher) is the *informational focus* because the initial point catches the listener's/reader's attention while the final position has the highest CD and delivers major information. Following the same analogy, *xin laoshi* (the new teacher) becomes the *attentional focus* in (57) while *dao le xue xiao* (came to the school) is the *informational focus*. Basically, the *attentional focus* indicates that this is the point that needs attention and this is the point on which further information will build up. *Informational focus*, on the other hand, indicates that here is the piece of information completing the communicative task.

Second, closely associated with *attentional focus*, another notion of focus known as *contrastive focus* is realized by prosodic means, such as stresses and pitch differences, the starting point of a sentence (Hu, 1995) and the contrastive focus marker *shi* (glossed as FM below) (Xu, 2003). Phonological means such as stresses and pitch differences are not discussed in this study for two reasons: one is that, compared to European languages, Chinese uses more syntax and less phonology in focus realization (Xu, 2003); the other is that prosodic means and pitch differences are beyond the scope of the present study.

A typical example of *contrastive focus* realized by the starting point, offered by Hu (1995), is given as follows:

(58) **张 三** 我 喜欢, **李 四** 我 不 喜欢。
Zhang San wo xihuan, Li Si wo bu xihuan.
Zhang San I like, Li Si I not like
I like Zhang San, but I don't like Li Si (p. 85).

In (58) *Zhang San* is both the *attentional focus* and the *contrastive focus* contrasting with *Li Si*. The contrast of word order in (58) is much stronger than that in (59) because the starting point of a sentence tends to attract more of listener's/reader's attention:

(59) 我 喜欢 张 三, 我 不 喜欢 李 四。
Wo xihuan Zhang San, wo bu xihuan Li Si.
I like Zhang San I not like Li Si
I like Zhang San, but I don't like Li Si.

A good example of *contrastive focus* realized by the contrastive focus marker (FM) *shi*, provided by Xu (2003, p. 279), is cited below:

(60a) 是 **老 王** 昨天 来 过。
Shi Lao Wang zuotian lai guo.
FM Lao Wang yesterday come ASP
It was Lao Wang who came yesterday.

(60b) 老 王 是 **昨天** 来 过。
Lao Wang shi zuotian lai guo.
Lao Wang FM yesterday come ASP
It was yesterday that Lao Wang came.

(60c) 老 王 昨天 是 **来 过**。
Lao Wang zuotian shi lai guo.
Lao Wang yesterday FM come ASP
Lao Wang did come yesterday.

The item after the FM *shi* (the highlighted part) is the *contrastive focus*, which is *Lao Wang* (the person in question) in (60a), *zuotian* (yesterday) in (60b) and *lai guo* (came) in (60c). The implied meaning or contrast in (60a) is "It was Lao Wang who came yesterday, not anybody else"; in (60b) is "It was yesterday that Lao Wang came, not the

day before yesterday or any other day"; and in (60c) "Lao Wang did come yesterday, it is a fact, not my imagination or dream or whatever".

In sum, these different foci serve different functions in communication. The *attentional focus* is often at the sentence initial position, which indicates information needing attention. The *informational focus* is often at the sentence final position indicating the importance of the information for completing the communicative task. The *contrastive focus* can be realized by the starting point or by the focus marker (*shi*), indicating information needing a contrastive interpretation.

One cannot overstress the importance of the functional principles in Chinese. Chen (1995) emphasizes this point:

> Cognitive-pragmatic considerations take over the task of arranging word order, a task fulfilled by case marking in some languages and by syntactic ordering in others. In this sense, Chinese offers an almost unique case for typological research: If it is not the most pragmatically-motivated language, it is certainly among those which are (p. 218).

Compared to English, Chinese relies more heavily on word order variations to realize different functions in communication. Thus, functional word order principles play a more crucial role in Chinese than in English.

4.3.3. Grammatical principle

Hu (1995) maintains that the grammatical system of a language to a great extent reflects our conceptual structure. However, once conventionalised, it has its own principles of organization. The only grammatical principle governing Chinese word order found in Tai (1989a) and Hu (1995) is called *the Modifier-Before-the-Modified*, or *the Modifier-Before-Head*.

The Modifier-Before-Head principle (MBH) (7)

MBH requires the word order of a modifier appear before the noun it modifies in Chinese no matter the modifier is an adjective, an attributive clause, a prepositional phrase, a gerund or an infinitive verb phrase. Examples (61) and (62) in the following, where the underlined parts are the modifiers and the bold-font parts are the modified/head, show that the modifier goes before the modified/head in Chinese while the modifier goes after the modified/head in English. These two examples also demonstrate the Principled-Branching-Direction (PBD) difference in the two

languages, namely Chinese is principally left-branching (PLB) while English is principally right-branching (PRB), as discussed in Chapter 1 (see p. 12).

(61) 昨天 我 买 的**那 本 书** 很 有 趣。
Zuotian wo mai de nei ben shu hen you qu.
Yesterday I buy that book very interesting
The book I bought yesterday is very interesting.

(62) 比我 大两 岁 的**姐姐** 是 个 医生。
Bi wo da liang sui de jiejie shi ge yisheng.
Compare I old two years *de* sister is M doctor
My sister who is two years older than I am is a doctor.

Other English modifiers may appear before their heads as Chinese ones do although attributive clauses appear after their heads in English. Example (63) shows that adjectival modifiers appear before their heads in both Chinese and English.

(63) **她 的 红** 上衣 很 漂亮。
Ta de hong shangyi hen piaoliang.
Her red top very beautiful
Her red top is very beautiful.

In (63), both *ta de* 'her' and *hong* 'red' are modifiers of *shangyi* 'top' and they both appear before *shangyi*.

In Chinese, the MBH principle is syntactically constrained and very often is referred to as a grammatical rule. It provides an explanation for the word order error sub-category of Noun + adjective, where an adjective should precede a noun. This sub-category is under Ko's (1997) category of *Modification Structures,* as shown in Table 3.5 on page 76.

4.3.4. Empathetic Principle (EP) (8)

As shown in Table 3.9 (p. 86), the Empathetic Principle (EP) is not included in any of the three domains of word order principles identified by Hu (1995). It may belong to a different domain, which needs to be examined later in relation to the data collected. The EP principle refers to "egodeictic iconicity" and "sociocentricity" in language use (Ho, 1993, p. 171). It means that speakers tend to refer to themselves before others and also tend to refer to what is socially, spatially and temporally nearer than what is socially, spatially and temporally farther away, unless it is

the case a speaker needs to show politeness to others (Ho, 1993). This phenomenon is also referred to as empathy (Kuno, 1987). It is found in Ertel's (1977) study that utterances like *My sister is your daughter* and *My nephew is your brother* are processed faster and more smoothly by language users than utterances like *Your daughter is my sister* and *Your brother is my nephew*. This suggests that speakers are preferentially more interested in themselves than others, and more interested in people who are closer in relationship than those farther in relationship. In word order arrangement, speakers tend to put "my" before "your" as cited above, and tend to mention people who are more closely related than those who are more distantly related.

Ho (1993) cited a number of culturally acceptable sequences of two juxtaposed kinship terms of either address or reference in Chinese, which are quoted with slight change in the English translation in (64) and (65) as follows:

(64) 爸爸 妈妈
Baba mama
Dad mum
Father and mother

叔叔　婶婶
Shushu shenshen
Uncle aunt
Father's younger brother and his wife

舅舅 舅母
Jiujiu jiumu
Uncle aunt
Mother's brother and his wife

哥哥 姐姐
Gege jiejie
Brother sister
Elder brother elder sister

弟弟 妹妹
Didi meimei
Brother sister
Younger brother and younger sister

儿子 媳妇
Erzi xifu
Son daughter-in-law
Son and his wife

(65) 姑姑 姑父
Gugu gufu
Aunt uncle
Father's sister and her husband

姨母 姨父
Yimu yifu
Aunt uncle
Mother's sister and her husband

姐姐 姐夫
Jiejie jiefu
Elder sister brother-in-law
Elder sister and her husband

妹妹 妹夫
Meimei meifu
Younger sister brother-in-law
Younger sister and her husband

女儿 女婿
Nüer nüxu
Daughter son-in-law
Daughter and her husband

The sequence in both (64) and (65) strictly conforms to the principle of sociocentrism. In (64) the "male term sociocentrically precedes the female term, corresponding to the socially acceptable patrilineal and patrilocal kinship system practiced in Chinese society" (Ho, 1993, p. 174), where descent is reckoned along the male line and married couples live with the husband's family. In (65), however, the male term follows, instead of preceding, the female term, "because the relations with these males are affinal – established through marriage" (Ho, 1993, p. 174). In the network of the extended family, the female members in (65) are related by consanguinity, having closer affinity than their spouses. They are therefore sociocentrically placed before the male terms.

Another case in point is that people usually refer to their own country first when talking about relations between their own country and a foreign country. For example, in talking about the relations between China and Australia, it is *China-Australia relations* in China while it is *Australia-China relations* in Australia. When people talk about their institutions, the same sociocentric order applies. For example, in talking about competitions between the two well-known universities in the UK, it is *Cambridge-Oxford* in Cambridge and *Oxford-Cambridge* in Oxford.

Chinese and English share the same word order sequence in the examples of (65), but not so in (64). In English, the word order of addressing one's parents is *Mum and Dad*, instead of *Dad and Mum*. A number of Australian colleagues and friends have confirmed that they have never used the order of *Dad and Mum* when they refer to their parents. It seems that the order of *Mum and Dad* is strictly followed by native English speakers. They have also mentioned the reason that *Mum* precedes *Dad* may be because (1) people generally feel *Mum* is closer than *Dad*; and (2) *Mother* is glorified in the English Christian culture. Roland Sussex (2005), a professor in applied linguistics at The University of Queensland, says, "The word order of *Mum and Dad* is simply the English habit or it is a social convention". It needs to be pointed out that phonological correlation also plays a role in determining the word order of juxtaposed phrases, such as short vowel before long vowel and front vowel before back vowel (Sussex, 2005). This factor in determining word order is beyond the scope of this study.

The Empathetic Principle can also explain the tendency whereby a human noun precedes a non-human noun in Chinese because people feel closer in relation to human nouns. Examples can be found in Ho (1993, p. 177).

4.4. Relationship between different domains of principles

The principles and sub-principles listed in Table 3.9 (p. 86) have been reviewed and demonstrated with examples. These principles and sub-principles provide a means to describe and explain how and why Chinese L2 word order errors occur. They form the core operating system governing Chinese word order and its variations. Violation of any of them leads to a word order error.

The principles of different domains discussed above are related to each other through a slow process of grammaticalization. Grammatical-

ization refers to a process by which language items change "from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status" (Heine, Claudi, & Hunnemeyer, 1991, p. 3). Heine et al. (1991) further explain that grammaticalization is motivated by cognitive activities:

> ... grammaticalization [is] the result of a process involving a transfer from 'concrete' to 'abstract' domains of conceptualization on the one hand and conversational implicatures and context-induced reinterpretation on the other. This process leads to the emergence of grammaticalized structures as the conventionalized, frozen, or fossilized product of those cognitive activities (p. 248).

The conceptual and functional principles are on the continuum of grammaticalization towards grammatical principles. In other words, the grammatical principles constitute conventionalized conceptual and functional principles brought about by the process of grammaticalization. The three domains of principles both cooperate and compete in governing Chinese word order and its variations (Hu, 1995). In Hu's words: "I hold that various word order phenomena are due to the result of competition and co-operation among conceptional [conceptual] principles, grammatical principles and functional principles" (p. 20).

As stated in Chapter Two (p. 54), the Cognitive Functionalist Approach has been identified to be the most suitable theoretical framework to guide the present project in examining Chinese L2 word order errors. This approach can account for all the three domains of word order principles. Given that the three domains of principles function at three different levels, that is, grammatical domain at the syntactic level; conceptual domain at the cognitive level and functional domain at the pragmatic level (Hu, 1995), the Cognitive Functionalist Approach is best demonstrated by explaining the conceptual principles.

5. The proposed criterion for categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors

As demonstrated earlier, some of the word order principles and sub-principles listed in Table 3.9 (see p. 86) have high explanatory value for most of the word order error categories listed in Table 3.5 (see p. 76). Table 3.10 below presents a summary of the word order error categories and the violated word order principles and sub-principles.

Table 3.10 Word order error categories and principles & sub-principles violated

Category	**Sub-category**	**Principles and sub-principles violated**
Time and Place Words		1. PTS & 2. WBP
Modification Structures	Noun + adjective Verb + adverb	7. MBH 1.5 Modifier + V
Topic-comment Relations		
Inappropriateness	(13) B: *#Ni dao dui de difang lai le.* (14) A2: *#Suoyi, xianzai wo you jia zai Foluolida.* (15) B: *#Wo zai Hongzhou yao jiehun.*	1.1 Action Series 1.2 Locative Expressions 1.2 Locative Expressions
Miscellaneous		

As shown in Table 3.10, Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy has been extended. Moreover, the word order errors under the category of Time and Place Words have been classified into two types: Type A violates PTS while Type B violates WBP. This indicates that the category of Time and Place Words can be further classified into, at least, two sub-categories.

The categories and sub-categories in Table 3.10 indicate that Ko's taxonomy is too limited to cover all the word order error categories emerging from the literature. It is most likely that this taxonomy is also limited for describing word order errors made by the Chinese L2 learners in this study.

Another problem with Ko's taxonomy is that the criteria used for categorization remain unclear. According to James (1998), errors are to be categorized according to certain observable criteria. A mere listing of errors, thus, is not a taxonomy. Based on Table 3.10 and earlier discussions of the explanatory value of word order principles and sub-principles for the word order error categories, it has been shown that the violation of a relevant word order principle or sub-principle results in a word order error. So, it is likely that the violation of any of these word order principles or sub-principles can be utilized as the sole criterion to categorize word order errors made by Chinese L2 learners. This study will examine how successful this criterion is in categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed four studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition and found that none has investigated the roles of the two underlying word order principles (PTS and WBP) that emerge from the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar. A review of Chinese L2 word order error studies has found that Ko's (1997) word order error taxonomy can be extended. By combining the word order error types emerging from the four Chinese L2 word order acquisition studies with Ko's taxonomy, a starting point for this study in developing a comprehensive word order error taxonomy has been established, as shown in Table 3.5 (p. 76). The explanatory value of PTS and WBP for the word order error categories listed in Table 3.5 has also been examined, finding that PTS and WBP are highly valuable in explaining most of the word order error categories. Given the importance of PTS and WBP and the inevitable reliance on word order principles in Chinese L2 word order acquisition research, Chinese word order principles have been systematically reviewed. After applying the word order principles and sub-principles to explain the existing word order error categories, it has been found that the violation of any basic word order principle or sub-principle leads to a word order error. It is proposed that the violation of any basic word order principle or sub-principle can be utilized as the sole criterion for categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors.

Empirical data is needed to investigate how successful this criterion is in categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors. The following chapter presents the methodology employed in the investigation.

Chapter Four: Research methodology

The principal aim of the book is to develop a comprehensive Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy in order to enable a clear description and explanation of Chinese L2 word order errors. In the literature review chapters, it has been demonstrated that Chinese word order principles and sub-principles have high explanatory value for various word order errors. Among the four word order error categories emerging from the literature (Time and Place Words, Modification Structures, Inappropriateness and Topic-comment Relations), the first three are adequately explained by violations of relevant existing word order principles or sub-principles. It is proposed that violation of any basic word order principle or sub-principle can be utilized as the sole criterion for categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors. This chapter discusses the research methodology employed for conducting this categorization. It consists of three sections. The first section introduces broad methodological concerns. The second section argues for a cross-sectional research design by comparing longitudinal and cross-sectional designs. The final section reviews Error Analysis (EA) methodology: its importance to this study, its development, its limitations and its current application in L2 acquisition research.

1. Broad methodological concerns

The methodology of a certain piece of research cannot be separated from the research questions driving that research (Nunan, 1996). The value of any particular method lies in how well it answers a particular research question in a particular situation and whether it offers important insights. In Nunan's (1996) words, "the questions being addressed by the researcher should determine how data are to be collected and analyzed" (p. 349). There exists no single methodology for SLA research in general; different methodologies commonly employed in SLA studies possessing different strengths and weaknesses. It is important for a researcher to be aware of the strengths and weakness of the methodology

employed in a study, so s/he can make use of its relevant strengths in addressing a particular research question while taking care not to generalize findings beyond its inherent weaknesses.

2. A cross-sectional research design

There are two well-established research designs for studying L2 acquisition, namely longitudinal and cross-sectional (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Nunan, 1996). A longitudinal design requires a researcher to obtain data from an L2 learner or a group of learners over a period of time while a cross-sectional design collects samples of L2 data at one point in time from learners who are at different proficiency levels or different developmental stages. In order to choose an appropriate research design for the present study, it is necessary to know the characteristics of both research designs and their strengths and weaknesses in SLA research. In the following, a comparison between the two research designs is provided and, in so doing, specific reasons for the choice of a cross-sectional design for this study emerge.

2.1. Comparison of longitudinal and cross-sectional research designs

A longitudinal design seeks to obtain evidence on the development of an L2 over time while a cross-sectional design obtains data at one point in time from learners who are at different developmental stages. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) summarize the two research designs as follows:

> A longitudinal approach (often called a case study in the SLA field) typically involves observing the development of linguistic performance, usually the spontaneous speech of one subject, when the speech data are collected at periodic intervals over a span of time. In a cross-sectional approach, the linguistic performance of a larger number of subjects is studied, and the performance data are usually collected at only one session. Furthermore, the data are usually elicited by asking subjects to perform some verbal task, such as having subjects describe a picture (p. 11).

Based on Gass and Selinker (1994), Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) and Miller (1987), Table 4.1 summarizes the characteristics of both longitudinal and cross-sectional research designs in the SLA field, including the number of participants, amount of descriptive details, type of data, type of analysis, advantages and disadvantages.

Table 4.1 Comparison of longitudinal and cross-sectional designs in SLA research

	Longitudinal	**Cross-sectional**
Number of participants	Generally case studies with data being collected from small number of learners, sometimes only one learner over a prolonged period of time. The frequency of data collection varies, but likely to be collected weekly, biweekly, or monthly.	Generally consists of data gathering at a single point of time from a large number of learners who are at different developmental stages.
Amount of descriptive detail	The detail is often provided on a learner's speech. There is also information on the situational context in which the words were said and on other details relevant to the analysis of the data.	Participants are not identified individually. Detailed descriptive information on the situational context of data is not provided either.
Type of data	Often spontaneous oral data are collected.	Often (but not always) based on controlled data.
Type of analysis	Often in the form of descriptive qualitative comments or narrative expositions. Whereas quantification of data may not be the goal of such studies, the researcher may report the frequency of occurrence of some form. In the reporting of results from longitudinally collected data, there are likely to be specific examples of what a learner said and how the utterances are to be interpreted.	There is typically an experimental format to the research, both in design and in analysis. Results tend to be more quantitative and less descriptive than in longitudinal studies, with statistical analyses and their interpretation being integral parts of the research report.
Advantages	• Highly useful in determining developmental trends and in interpreting various social constraints and input influences on the learner's speech. • L2 acquisition development can be directly investigated.	• It is more likely that the results can be generalized to a wider group. • Less time-consuming since it requires only one data collection session. • Less difficult to bring to successful completion, since it is less demanding for participants. • Less expensive.
Disadvantages	• Time-consuming, since it requires time for collecting data at regular intervals, as well as in transcription of the speech data.	• There is often no detailed information about the speakers themselves or linguistic environment

• Lack of generalizability. Given that longitudinal studies are often limited in their number of learners investigated, it is difficult to generalize the results. It is difficult to know with any degree of certainty whether the results obtained are applicable only to the one or two learners studied, or whether they are indeed characteristic of a wide range of learners. • Participants can drop out. It is more difficult to bring to successful completion. • More expensive.	in which production is elicited. Both types of information may be central to an appropriate interpretation of the data. • L2 acquisition development cannot be directly investigated.

As shown in Table 4.1 above, both longitudinal and cross-sectional approaches have their own advantages and disadvantages. The disadvantages of longitudinal research design provide a primary motivation for cross-sectional research design and vice versa. One cannot generally say one is better than the other. The particular approach one chooses depends on the research questions one intends to answer and the practicalities one faces in bringing the research project to completion (Gass & Selinker, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). In addition, it should also be pointed out that the characteristics of each research design are relative rather than absolute.

2.2. Justification for a cross-sectional research design

A cross-sectional research design better suits this project because it aims to develop a Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy, which encompasses a variety of word order errors. The larger the corpus of word order errors, the more comprehensive the taxonomy to be developed will be. As shown in Table 4.1, a cross-sectional research design enables the project to involve a large number of Chinese L2 learners at different proficiency levels as participants. Such a cohort is more likely to produce a greater number of word order errors than a limited number of learners examined over a period of time as a longitudinal design permits. This is the most important reason for the choice of a cross-sectional design in this study.

A second reason for a cross-sectional research design lies in the fact that L2 learners' interlanguage performance manifests individual differences. Some learners are more willing to take risks and make more errors than others (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). According to Brown (2000), there are at least two kinds of learners of L2. Some learners are more reflective and reserved. They rarely take initiative in producing utterances unless they are sure. So they do not make many errors. Other learners are more impulsive in the learning process of second language. They are more extemporaneous and often produce a target language response without hesitation. As a result, they make more errors. Given that a longitudinal design can only study a very limited number of learners, there exists the risk that the learners in the selected sample may be largely of the first type and not make many errors.

A third reason lies in the fact that the researcher has more control with a cross-sectional design and is more likely to bring the research project to completion, since the possibility of participants dropping out and thus jeopardizing the research project, a primary disadvantage of a longitudinal design, is avoided.

3. Error Analysis (EA)

This section presents the rationale for the use of Error Analysis (EA) methodology in this book. It consists of four sub-sections. The first sub-section discusses why EA is important to this study. The second sub-section reviews the development of EA in order to provide a general picture of EA in relation to SLA. The third sub-section discusses the deemed limitations of EA. The final sub-section provides a detailed description of the EA methodology and procedures used in the study.

3.1. Importance of EA to this study

As stated earlier, the principal aim of the present research project is to develop a comprehensive Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy that provides an explicit description of Chinese L2 word order errors. This description, it is hoped, will provide a better understanding of word order errors that will benefit theory development and more immediate pedagogical practice. Such a taxonomy can only be developed by investigating and analyzing Chinese L2 word order errors empirically. *Error*

Analysis (EA) provides a methodology for investigating learner errors that has been widely used (Ellis, 1994; James, 1998).

As a research tool for the development of interlanguage theory, EA has attracted significant criticism. This is mainly due to what is perceived to be the overly-narrow focus on learner errors alone (Ellis, 1994). However, while the limitations of the method for theory development are recognised, it remains a valid and appropriate tool when errors are of paramount concern. In the classroom, errors are a real and urgent issue that command teachers' attention. As a result, EA can play an important role in identifying and categorizing errors made by L2 learners. In James' (1998) words, "Error Analysis (EA) continues to enjoy widespread appeal. The explanation is not hard to find: teachers cannot escape from a preoccupation with learners' errors, and they are attracted towards EA by its promise of relevance to their everyday professional concerns" (p. x). Few would argue with the proposition that written accuracy is important to students in many contexts and that students themselves want and expect feedback on their written errors from their teachers (Ferris, 1995; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Lee, 2004; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Rennie, 2000; Truscott, 1996). However, L2 teachers are not always capable of adequately identifying and explaining the nature of errors made. For example, Lee's (2004) study shows that "only slightly over half of the teachers' error feedback was accurate" (p. 302). When teachers fail to provide accurate error feedback, it is doubtful that the learner will be able to address the error. Ferris (1999) also points out that "poorly done error correction will not help student writers and may even mislead them" (p. 4). Fortunately, EA provides a means to empower L2 teachers in that their error feedback can be made more effective and more beneficial for L2 learners. This constitutes a significant motivation for conducting the present project.

3.2. Development of EA

EA developed from its predecessor Contrastive Analysis (CA), which was originally formulated by Fries (1945) and developed and popularized by his student Lado (1957). CA was employed to compare two grammar systems, the learner's native language (NL) and target language (TL) and to map points of contrasts. According to Lado (1957), CA was an effective way of comparing a learner's NL and TL to iden-

tify similarities and differences. It was hypothesized that the similar structures would be easy for learners to master; the different structures would be difficult, and, as a result, would lead to language errors. The ultimate purpose of CA was to determine potential difficulties in learning the targeted L2 and to isolate what needed to be taught and what did not need to be taught in an L2 learning situation. For a decade or so, language teachers were very optimistic about this predictive ability of CA.

Before long, however, it became obvious that CA had theoretical limitations. Empirical studies showed that not all the similarities between first language and target language were easy to master, nor were all the differences difficult. Some difficulties that were not predicted by CA at all did exist (Dulay & Burt, 1973, 1974a, 1974b, 1974c; Schachter, 1992). Therefore, a shift of interest from potential errors to those actually committed by language learners followed, which became a new field in applied linguistics at that time, known as Error Analysis (EA).

The CA paradigm was also affected by the rise of Chomsky's theory of language learning, which began to view language acquisition not as a product of habit formation, as CA is often associated with, but rather as one of rule formation. The creative theory of language (Chomsky, 1965) postulated that humans hold an innate ability for learning languages, which is known as the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) (see Chapter Two, p. 30). LAD enables humans to deduce the rules of the target language from the available input, by the process of hypothesizing and testing. Once acquired, these rules would allow learners to comprehend and produce novel utterances that they have never come across before.

Second language learning came to be regarded as a creative process of constructing a system, rather than imitating and memorizing to form habits, meaning that behaviourist-inspired CA lost its theoretical underpinning. EA emerged as an attempt to understand the construction of the interlanguage system by focusing on the errors that learners make. EA occupied the mainstream in the SLA research in the 1960s and 1970s. However, by the late 1970s and early 1980s, the usefulness of EA in SLA research was questioned by many in the field and the method fell out of favour among researchers. These criticisms are discussed below in 3.3. However, EA has recently been revitalized following significant works in the framework by James, (1998), Kellerman (1995), Kellerman and Sharwood-Smith (1986), Lee (1997, 2004), Leki (1991), Lennon (1991) and Selinker (1992). Renewed interest in EA is

driven by the desire to better understand the cognitive, linguistic and pragmatic complexities involved in SLA, as well as the desire to improve L2 teaching (James, 1998).

3.3. Limitations of EA

As discussed above, EA experienced popularity in the 1960s, lost some appeal during the late 1970s and has revitalized since the 1990s. During the 1970s, EA was often criticized in that it only presents a partial picture of what a learner produces of the second/foreign language, namely the errors. Specifically, EA was criticized as being limited in the following aspects:

(1) EA is carried out from the point of view of the researcher, not the learner. To the learner, his/her language is not erroneous, it is just his/her interlanguage (Corder, 1974; Ellis; 1994; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).
(2) EA only concentrates on sentences with errors and neglects correct sentences. In other words, EA isolates erroneous sentences from their context. It does not treat learners' language as a whole product (Ellis; 1994; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).
(3) When L2 learners have difficulty in using certain structures, they might choose to avoid using those structures. In this case, the structures L2 learners avoid cannot be studied at all because EA researchers are only interested in errors (Schachter, 1974, 1986, 1992; Schachter & Celce-Murcia, 1977).
(4) An assumption of early EA studies is that correct usage is equivalent to correct rule formation, which might not be the case due to limited sampling bias (Gass & Selinker, 2001).

These deemed limitations, however, were not inherent to EA as a research method. They were actually limitations of SLA research at the early stage (James, 1998). When EA was treated as the only perspective of SLA research, as it was during the 1960s and early 1970s, it was limited in the ways listed above. These limitations are no longer directly relevant to EA revitalized after the 1990s, since it does not claim to provide a whole picture of interlanguage development.

Specifically, the first limitation is not of direct relevance to the current EA project because the focus of this project is not on interlanguage

theory development, but on the pedagogical value of EA in helping teachers handle errors in the classroom. In relation to the second limitation, EA does not necessarily isolate erroneous sentences from their context. Word order errors due to inappropriateness in this study, for example, are only errors when context is considered. In response to the third limitation, the present study employs a large cohort of participants. When some learners avoid using certain structures, others may not. The final limitation is considered of little relevance to the current EA study because this study aims to categorize Chinese L2 word order errors, not to define the acquisition of certain word order structures.

In sum, while the limitations of EA for interlanguage theory development are recognised, it remains a valid and appropriate research method in helping L2 researchers and teachers successfully handle errors in the classroom.

3.4. EA in Chinese language acquisition studies

In this section, EA methodology is reviewed, limitations of previous Chinese EA studies are addressed and application of EA methodology to the present study is specified.

The methodology used in EA owes much to the work of Corder (1967, 1973, 1974, and 1981). Corder changed the behaviouristic view of errors, as something negative that language teachers were determined to eradicate, into something positive, as evidence of progress in the L2 learning process. He also developed a methodology for EA research. The five stages suggested by Corder (1974) and summarized by Ellis (1994) are as follows:

1. Collection of a sample of learner language
2. Identification of errors
3. Description of errors
4. Explanation of errors
5. Evaluation of errors

The first four stages are discussed below. Step 5, evaluation of errors, is not included in the methodology of this study for two reasons: (1) developing an error taxonomy does not need to include an evaluation of the errors; and (2) evaluation of errors is usually treated as a separate issue because it has its own methods of enquiry (Ellis, 1994).

3.4.1. Collection of a sample of learner language

Previous EA studies of Chinese L2 have been limited in many ways. One of the primary limitations is that studies were rarely conducted by collecting empirical data. For example, as mentioned in Chapter Three (p. 92), Lu (1997) conducted a series of studies employing EA of Chinese L2. He first provided the categories of errors, such as phonological, lexical, syntactic and pragmatic, and then provided examples for each of the categories. Thus, his categories of errors were prescribed rather than deduced from empirical data.

Ko's (1997) study is based on empirical data. Ko employed the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) method in data collection (ACTFL, 1989). So the medium of her data is speech. However, she did not specify other major factors in her data collection that influence the errors learners make, such as genre and topic. The EA methodology used in the present study is enhanced by collecting empirical L2 errors and by specifying the factors that influence errors learners make.

The errors that learners make, in fact, can be influenced by a variety of factors, for example, the features of the target L2, learners' proficiency level, learners' NL and the task involved in data collection, such as medium, genre and content. All these factors are important in "collecting a well-defined sample of learner language so that clear statements can be made regarding what kinds of errors the learners produce and under what conditions" (Ellis, 1994, p. 49). Ellis summarizes the major factors that can bring about variation in learner language, which are shown in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Factors to consider when collecting samples of learner language*

Factors	**Description**
A. Language	
Medium	Learner production can be oral or written
Genre	Learner production may take the form of a conversation, a lecture, an essay, a letter, etc.
Content	The topic the learner is communicating about
B. Learner	
Level	Elementary, intermediate, or advanced
Mother tongue	The learner's L1
Language learning experience	This may be classroom or naturalistic or a mixture of the two

*Source: Ellis, 1994, p. 49

Table 4.3 below specifies these factors in relation to the present study. The major factors relevant to the data collection in this study, namely medium, genre and content, are discussed below to justify their suitability to the research purpose. The factors relevant to details of learners are discussed in Chapter Five, The Study.

Table 4.3 Factors relevant to the Chinese L2 samples collected in this study

Factors	**Description**
A. Language	Chinese L2
1. Medium	Written
2. Genre	Letter, essay, diary
3. Content	Invitation to a dinner party (or dining experience) for letter; self-introduction, book commentary, description of a cartoon picture and trip to Beijing for the essay; and self-chosen topics for diary
B. Learner	116 learners
4. Level	Elementary, intermediate, or advanced
5. Mother tongue	English
6. Language learning experience	Classroom setting

Medium

As indicated in Table 4.2, medium is an important factor in learner's interlanguage production (Ellis, 1994). Whether oral/spoken or written medium better suits the research purpose of a study depends on the characteristics each medium manifests. Crystal (2001) summarizes the chief differences of spoken and written languages below:

> Speech is typically time-bound, spontaneous, face-to-face, socially interactive, loosely structured, immediately revisable, and prosodically rich. Writing is typically space-bound, contrived, visually decontextualized, factually communicative, elaborately structured, repeatedly revisable, and graphically rich (pp. 25–28).

The "elaborately structured" written language relies more on word order than the "loosely structured" spoken language in fulfilling communicative functions.

More specifically, Henrichsen (1978) differentiates spoken and written languages on three dimensions: medium, time and distance. While

the spoken *medium* is coded in sounds, the written *medium* is coded in symbols, and each of the two different coding systems has its own significant features. Speakers share *time* and *space* and collaborate in real time and in the same space. Writers and readers do not normally share either *time* or *space* and collaborate independently. As to *distance*, oral language favours context dependency and focuses on here-and-now involvement while written language is more detached. In other words, the *distance* between writers and readers is greater than that between speakers.

Chafe (1982) suggests two dimensions along which spoken and written productions differ: "involvement" versus "detachment", and "fragmentation" versus "integration" (pp. 38–39). These overlap with Henrichsen's (1978) three dimensions, since both refer to spoken language as being more involved while written language is regarded as being more detached. Of Chafe's two dimensions, the "fragmentation" versus "integration" dimension is more relevant to word order. In Chafe's (1982) words:

> The fragmentation of spoken language shows up partly in the stringing together of idea units without connectives. Sometimes a fragmented idea unit may consist of nothing more than a noun phrase or prepositional phrase.... Integration refers to the packing of more information into an idea unit than the rapid pace of spoken language would normally allow. Integrated [written] language makes use of a variety of devices for incorporating additional elements into an idea unit (pp. 38–39).

In other words, spoken language is characterized by syntactical incompleteness while written language is characterized by syntactical completeness. Based on the respective characteristics of spoken and written language discussed above, written production data is the medium selected for the purpose of developing a comprehensive Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy in the present study for the following reasons:

(1) The syntactical completeness of written language provides a foundation for the study of word order. In addition, written language relies more on word order to transmit the message intended because devices available in spoken language, such as stress, intonation and speaker's attitude conveyable through raising or lowering of voice, are not available in written language.
(2) The function of written language provides another rationale for the study of word order. Vachek (1987) makes this point clear in the following:

> The spoken and written norms of language are functionally clearly differentiated: the former serves a ready and immediate reaction to extralingual reality, the latter enables the language user to react to it in a documentary and easily surveyable manner. The functionalist conception of the written norm provides deeper insight into the functioning of language (p. 395).

(3) Most linguistic word order studies in Chinese are based on written data because in spoken language many variables, such as intonation, stress and speaker's attitude, interweave with word order to complete communicative functions. Thus, it is difficult to identify word order functions unless we know the roles other variables play. As noted by Chu (1998), "intonation, speaker's attitude, performance factor, etc., all are less well understood than overt written signals, especially in terms of Mandarin Chinese" (p. 4). Therefore, written data serves the research purpose better than oral data in this study.

Genre

Genre is another important factor in learner interlanguage production (Ellis, 1994). The language used in writing a lecture and in writing a personal letter is usually different in terms of choice of words and syntactic structures. In order to collect as many Chinese L2 word order errors as possible, ideally the more genres included the better. For example, LoCoco (1976) found differences in the number and types of errors in samples of learner interlanguage collected by means of free composition, translation and picture description. In the present study, three genres are included: letter, web-diary and essay.

Content

Content is a third important factor in learner interlanguage production (Ellis, 1994). Even within the same genre, for example, a letter, the language features in writing about dinner parties and about a trip to Europe vary. In order to collect as many Chinese L2 word order errors as possible, ideally the more different topics included the better. In the present study, the topic for the letter genre is an invitation to a dinner party. The topics for the essay genre include a commentary on a self-chosen book, a description of a cartoon picture and a trip to Beijing. The topic for the diary genre varies because it is self-chosen.

3.4.2. Identification of errors

As mentioned earlier, Ko's (1997) study is based on empirical data. However, no explicit criteria were found as to what constitutes an error

in her study. She used error examples instead of defining an error in her error identification. In her words: "What is the [an] error? For instance, incorrect word order, improper vocabulary usage, misuse of word function, etc." (p. 44). It appears that Ko relied on some implicit criteria and her native speaker intuition in the identification of Chinese L2 errors. The lack of explicit criteria renders the replication of her research difficult. The present study explicitly identifies criteria as to what constitutes a Chinese L2 word order error. Such an error lies not only in ungrammaticality but also in inappropriateness. The two criteria are discussed in more detail below.

Ungrammaticality and inappropriateness

Ungrammaticality is synonymous with 'ill-formedness', which is context-free (James, 1998). This means that if the word order of a sentence is ungrammatical, it is an error in any context. Inappropriateness, however, is context-dependent, which means the word order of a sentence can be grammatical independently but inappropriate in a certain context. In Corder's (1981) words, "Judgement about the appropriateness of an utterance requires that we interpret it in relation to its context and the situation in which it is uttered" (p. 40). As reviewed in Chapter Three section 1.3 (p. 63) and section 1.4 (p. 65), both Hu (1992) and Li (1999) identified two types of Chinese L2 word order errors. One type is due to ungrammaticality and the other is due to inappropriateness under context. Li (1999) concluded that, in terms of word order acquisition, grammaticality and appropriateness were achieved by learners at different stages of learning and, thus, were acquired separately. Although the present study is not designed to examine whether grammaticality and appropriateness are acquired separately in terms of Chinese L2 word order acquisition, the two types of word order errors must be considered and identified in the corpus of written samples.

The word order of a sentence is grammatical if it observes relevant principles or sub-principles listed in Table 3.9 (p. 86). Otherwise, it is an error due to ungrammaticality. Whether the word order of a sentence is appropriate depends on its context and the interpretation of the intended meaning in the context. Although the Chinese word order principles and sub-principles also account for word order errors due to inappropriateness, there is no universal rule for appropriateness. Word order is one of the most important cohesive devices in developing coherent discourse in Chinese as discussed earlier (see pp. 63–64), which

means that re-arrangement of the same items of a Chinese sentence forms different word order to suit different contexts. Examples (13), (14) and (15) cited in Chapter Three show this function of word order in Chinese and sentences (13)B, (14)A2 and (15)B are examples of word order errors due to inappropriateness.

Corder (1981) also distinguished *overt* from *covert* errors. An *overt* error has a clear deviation in form, as when a learner of Chinese says *Wo chi wanfan qi dian* (I have dinner at 7.00 pm), in which the adverbial of time *qi dian* (7.00 pm) should be placed before the verb *chi* (eat/have) instead of being placed at the end of the sentence. A *covert* error has superficial well-formedness, as shown in examples (13)B, (14)A2 and (15)B. These sentences are not appropriate in context although they are grammatically correct independently. The present study, while recognizing the two types of errors, will not employ the terms *overt* and *covert* errors, because the former, *overt* errors, can be categorized as errors due to ungrammaticality while the latter, *covert* errors, can be categorized as errors due to inappropriateness in context.

Corder (1967) also distinguished *errors* from *mistakes*. Although this distinction has been cited extensively in EA studies, it is not considered to be of much value to the present study. Firstly, there is some inconsistency between Corder's own definitions of the two terms. He associates *errors* with failures in competence and *mistakes* with failures in performance in his 1967 paper, making use of Chomsky's distinction. By 1971, however, he states that errors are "the result of some failure of performance" (Corder, 1971, p. 152). James (1998) notices this inconsistency and comments that "The *mistakes* of the 1967 paper are the *errors* of the 1971 paper. What were originally competence-based *errors* are now features of the learner's idiosyncratic dialect" (p. 79). The inconsistency of Corder's definitions of *errors* and *mistakes* casts doubt on the value of differentiating them.

Secondly, this distinction between *errors* and *mistakes* was based on the assumption that L2 competence is homogeneous, which ignored the variability of learner language (Ellis, 1994; Tarone, 1988, 1990). Moreover, self-correction is considered to be the criterion in judging between *errors* and *mistakes* where only *mistakes* can be self-corrected (James, 1998). It is not practical to apply this criterion in learner's written data because self-correction is more associated with spoken language, on the one hand, and on the other hand, researchers do not always have access to the learners after they collect their written samples. In Ellis' (1994) words:

> Corder's (1967) distinction between errors and mistakes is not easy to put into practice, even if the learner is available to provide an 'authoritative interpretation'. In addition, the distinction does not take account of the possibility that learners' knowledge is variable (pp. 52–54).

Thirdly, due to the inadequacy of the distinction between *errors* and *mistakes*, Lennon (1991) redefined errors as "a linguistic form or combination of forms, which in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts" (p. 182). This definition, employed by most recent EA researchers (e.g. James, 1998), covers the scope of ungrammatical errors as well as the scope of inappropriate errors.

In summary, ungrammaticality and inappropriateness are the two criteria employed in judging whether the word order of a sentence is erroneous. If the word order of a sentence violates any of the principles or sub-principles listed in Table 3.9 (p. 86), it is ungrammatical, hence constituting an error. As to the judgment whether the word order of a sentence is appropriate, it depends on the interpretation of its intended meaning in context, which is elaborated in more detail below.

The role of interpretation

In order to identify whether a sentence in the written samples of learner language collected is erroneous, one needs to compare the sentence with what should have been written to express the intended meaning. As Corder (1981) argues, "We identify errors by comparing original utterances with what I shall call *reconstructed* utterances, that is, correct utterances having the meaning intended by the learner" (p. 37). As a result, the correct interpretation of learner's intended meaning is crucial for the accuracy of error identification and description.

In order to ensure the validity of interpretation of a learner's language sample, more than one native speaking rater, trained in the methodology, should be used. Inter-rater reliability between the raters can be calculated to show the reliability of their respective interpretations.

3.4.3. Description of errors

A description of errors is a prerequisite for an explanation of errors (Corder, 1981). Specifically, description of errors serves three main purposes, as James (1998) summarizes:

> The first is to make explicit what otherwise would be tacit and on the level of intuition, so as to justify one's intuitions. A second purpose of description is that it is a prerequisite for counting errors: in order to ascertain how many instances of this or that type you have, it is necessary to gather tokens into types. The third function of description and labelling is to create categories (pp. 96–97).

Similar errors are identified through description and putting similar errors together creates categories of errors: this is the process of developing a taxonomy of errors.

However, previous Chinese EA studies lack precision in the definition of error categories (Ko, 1997). For example, one finds that the word order error *Ji kuai qian ni you*? "How much money do you have?" where the correct form is *Ni you ji kuai qian*?, is described as an error of "a word-for-word equivalent of a semantically similar sentence in the learner's NL, English" (Ko, 1997, p. 37). Such a statement does not indicate the exact category of the error. It merely indicates that the error occurs due to the learner's NL influence. A clear description of various word order errors in Chinese L2 is not yet available.

The taxonomies commonly used in describing errors in other languages like English are variously organized by *surface strategy*, *linguistic category* and *systematicity* (Ellis, 1994). Each of these approaches is discussed below to see whether they can be extended to describe Chinese L2 word order errors.

The surface strategy taxonomy

This taxonomy "highlights the ways surface structures are altered" (Dulay et al., 1982, p. 150) by means of such classifications as omissions, additions, misinformations and misorderings (for examples, see Dulay et al., 1982, p. 150 or Ellis, 1994, p. 56). Corder (1981) states that "This superficial classification of errors is only a starting point for systematic analysis" (p. 36). In accordance with Corder, this researcher also regards the surface strategy taxonomy as a starting point in the description of errors. In order to be more useful for language teachers, error classification should be extended to a deeper level.

The linguistic category taxonomy

This type of taxonomy carries out specification of errors in terms of linguistic categories, such as phonology, vocabulary, syntax, and discourse. As Ellis (1994) comments, "This type [of taxonomy] is closely associated with traditional EA undertaken for pedagogic purposes, as

the linguistic categories can be chosen to correspond closely to those found in structural syllabuses and language text books" (p. 54). For example, Dušková (1969) identified 1007 errors in the written work of 50 Czech learners of English, who were postgraduate students studying science. She found 756 "recurrent systemic errors" (p. 15) and 251 "nonce mistakes" (i.e. errors that occurred once only, p. 15). Errors in articles were most common (260), followed by errors in lexis (233) and morphology (180). In comparison, there were only 69 errors in syntax and 48 in word order. Dušková noted that although she had few difficulties in assigning errors to general linguistic categories such as 'word order', it often proved very difficult to classify them accurately into subcategories. Actually the subcategories would prove more helpful because the general category of 'word order error' does not specify what exactly is going wrong. The more detailed the description, the more helpful it is in explaining the error.

Corder's systematicity taxonomy

According to Ellis (1994), although surface strategy and linguistic category taxonomies of errors may have a pedagogic application, in general "they shed little light on how learners learn an L2" (p. 56). Corder's (1974) framework for describing errors is more promising in this respect. Corder distinguishes three types of error according to their systematicity (in Ellis, 1994, p. 56):

a) Presystematic errors occur when the learner is unaware of the existence of a particular rule in the target language. These are random.
b) Systematic errors occur when the learner has discovered a rule but it is the wrong one.
c) Postsystematic errors occur when the learner knows the correct target language rule but uses it inconsistently (i.e. making a mistake).

As Ellis further explains, "In order to identify these different kinds of errors, however, it is necessary to interview the learner" (p. 56). If the learner cannot give any account of why s/he chooses a particular form, the error belongs to type (a); if the learner can explain why s/he chooses a form but cannot correct it, the error belongs to type (b); and if the learner can correct an error, this error belongs to type (c). The disadvantages of this taxonomy are twofold: (1) the researchers do not always have access to the learners after they have collected the data; and (2) even when the learners are available, they are not always capable of pro-

viding explanations for their language performance. Therefore, this taxonomy, though attractive, may be difficult to put into practice.

In summary, three error taxonomies have been discussed. *The surface strategy taxonomy*, based on surface features of learner language, serves as a starting point in describing errors. *Corder's systematicity taxonomy* sheds light on how learners learn an L2; however, it is not very practical because it requires learners' explanation of their own performance, which is not always possible. *The linguistic category taxonomy* is a useful categorization of errors in terms of where the error is located in the overall system of the target L2. The present study adopts the approach of this taxonomy. For this taxonomy to be more helpful in describing errors, more precise subcategories in each category of errors are needed. This study will develop subcategories in the category of word order errors, specifically Chinese L2 word order errors. The proposed criterion for categorizing these errors is violation of a relevant word order principle or sub-principle. Through such categorization, a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors will be developed.

3.4.4. Explanation of errors

Of the five stages in EA research, explanation of errors is the most important stage for SLA research because "it involves an attempt to establish the processes responsible for L2 acquisition" (Ellis, 1994, p. 57). Explanation is concerned with establishing the source of the error, that is, accounting for why it was made. The current project is more concerned with explanation of errors in a pedagogical sense. Using the available error sources, such as L1 influence, to explain various Chinese L2 word order errors is not sufficient for instruction purposes. Specific explanations for each type of word order errors are called for. However, previous Chinese EA studies do not provide such explanations for various Chinese L2 word order errors. Chapter Three has demonstrated that Ko's (1997) explanations of word order errors are also problematic (see pp. 90–95).

Theoretical explanation of errors in other languages like English has been developing since the CA era of the 1950s. At that time, only one source of errors, namely learners' L1, was identified. Traditional EA in the 1960s and 1970s attributed errors to three sources: the learner's first language, the target language structures and the teaching techniques. Accordingly, errors caused by these three main sources were named interlingual, intralingual and teaching-induced errors (Palmberg, 1980).

Present EA studies add one more source of errors, namely communication-strategy-based errors. According to James (1998), there is general agreement over the four main sources of errors: Interlingual, intralingual, teaching-induced and communication-strategy-based. Each of them is discussed below.

L1 influence: interlingual errors

Interlingual errors are often referred to as mother-tongue interference or negative transfer. As Ellis (1994) notes, "Transfer is, in fact, a very complex notion which is best understood in terms of cognitive rather than behaviourist models of learning" (p. 62). As the Cognitive Functionalist Grammar (see Chapter Two, p. 47) explains, adult learners' conceptualizations of the world, which are based on their L1, do not change easily when they start learning L2. This also explains why transfer errors are more common in adult learners than in child learners (Ellis, 1994).

Word order appears to be a good example to demonstrate the differences in native speakers' conceptualizations of the world based on their L1. For example, as demonstrated in Chapter Three (p. 94), Chinese word order observes the Whole-Before-Part principle (WBP) in conceptualizing space and time while English word order observes the opposite, namely the Part-Before-Whole principle, in conceptualizing space and time. Chinese word order observes the Temporal Sequence Principle (PTS) in arranging action series while English word order does not have to observe this principle.

Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) observe that L2 word order errors are often the result of learners relying on carrying out "word-for-word translations of native language surface structures" (p. 163) when producing written or spoken utterances in their target L2 performance. Cohen (1998) also finds that learners make use of mental translation when producing and processing an L2 sentence. In short, the L1 word order features provide one of the most important sources for adult learners' L2 word order errors. Thus, the cross-linguistic comparison of Chinese and English word orders conducted in Chapter One (see pp. 6–12) has laid down a foundation for explaining Chinese L2 word order errors in this study.

Target language causes: intralingual errors

Intralingual errors are regarded as errors independent of learners' L1. They are seen to be caused by learners' incompetence to successfully use

L2 structures. Richards (1974) distinguishes intralingual and developmental errors, as stated in the following:

> Intralingual errors are those which reflect the general characteristics of rule learning, such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules, and failure to learn conditions under which rules apply. Developmental errors illustrate the learner attempting to build up hypotheses about the English language [ESL] from his limited experience of it in the classroom or textbook (p. 174).

However, most researchers (e.g. Ellis, 1994; Schachter & Celce-Murcia, 1977) do not distinguish between intralingual and developmental errors, considering intralingual errors and developmental errors as synonyms.

Intralingual errors are often further subdivided. For example, Richards (1974) distinguishes four subcategories: overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules and misanalysis. For details and examples, see Richards (1974, pp. 174–181).

These four subcategories were classified based on English L2 data. They are valuable in explaining errors such as verb tenses and plural forms of nouns. However, they are not necessarily applicable to explaining Chinese word order errors. As demonstrated in Chapter Three, none of these subcategories are used to describe and explain the existing Chinese word order errors shown in Table 3.10 (p. 108). Instead, the Chinese word order principles and sub-principles shown in Table 3.9 (p. 86) form the core operating system governing Chinese word order and its variations, which when violated lead to word order errors (see pp. 45–54 for more discussion).

Teaching-induced errors

This category of errors results from "being misled by the ways in which teachers give definitions, examples, explanations and arrange practice opportunities" (James, 1998, p. 189). James subdivides errors of this type into five subcategories: "materials-induced error", "teacher-talk induced error", "exercise-based induced error", "pedagogical priority induced error" and "look-up error" (pp. 189–191). Material-induced errors are errors caused by inappropriate language usage in textbooks. Teacher-talk induced errors are caused by teachers' imprecise explanations. Exercise-based induced errors are caused by some manipulations of language required by certain exercises, such as sentence combining. Pedagogical priority induced errors are caused by teaching practices where priority is given to fluency, not accuracy. Look-up errors refer to errors resulting from looking up a dictionary or grammar book and

choosing a wrong item. Although James (1998) proposes these subcategories of teaching-induced errors, very few studies employing them can be found in the literature. It appears that the proportion of teaching-induced errors is too small to deserve much attention from L2 teachers and researchers.

Communication strategy-based errors

This type of error occurs when learners employ some near-equivalent L2 item to replace a required form that is found lacking during communication in the target L2 (James, 1998). It also has been referred to as a '*paraphrase*' communication strategy (Tarone, 1980). Tarone (1980) finds the strategy of '*paraphrase*' can manifest in three forms: (1) approximation, e.g. say 'animal' for 'horse'; (2) word coinage, e.g. using 'air ball' for 'balloon'; (3) circumlocution, e.g. learners talk their way around the word that they do not know – 'when you make a container' for 'pottery'. This type of error occurs more in oral than in written performance because learners have more time to think and often rely on dictionaries and other resources in written performance. Moreover, approximation, word coinage and circumlocution are not relevant to word order errors.

Although the above four sources of errors, namely interlingual, intralingual, teaching-induced and communication-strategy-based, have been identified in the literature, problems still abound in their use in explaining errors (James, 1998). In particular, "it is not easy to distinguish transfer and intralingual errors, and even more difficult to identify the different types of intralingual errors that Richards describes" (Ellis, 1994, p. 59). As a result, one researcher identifies the source of an error as transfer; another researcher identifies the source of the same error as intralingual. Moreover, an error might have more than one source. Another problem lies in the fact that the findings of EA studies are almost exclusively based on English L2 data. Very few studies have been found investigating other languages, especially non-European languages like Chinese.

The four error sources, although enlightening theoretically, are too general to provide effective account for Chinese L2 word order errors for language teachers and learners to make use of. For example, both of the two word order errors given in Chapter One, (7a) and (8a) (see p. 13), can be explained by L1 influence, that is, they are interlingual errors. However, it is still not known whether (7a) and (8a) belong to the same type of error, how did they occur and how to correct them. In

order to explicitly describe and clearly explain errors like (7a) and (8a), it has been proposed that the Chinese word order principles and sub-principles, reviewed and demonstrated in Chapter Three (see pp. 81–106), can help explain certain Chinese L2 word order errors. This approach of error explanation considers both interlingual and intralingual sources. It is ostensibly interlingual in that it compares word order principles in learners' L1 and L2. For the convenience of description, violations of Chinese word order principles are used for describing Chinese word order errors. In this sense, this approach is extended from the second error source: Intralingual. Moreover, it is an intralingual approach particularized to explain Chinese L2 word order errors. As demonstrated in Table 3.10 (p. 108), this approach can provide specific explanations for the source of particular Chinese L2 word order errors.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed methodological concerns relevant to the current project. It has provided justification for the choice of a cross-sectional research design. Such a design enables the project to involve a larger number of Chinese L2 learners at different proficiency levels and obtain a greater number of word order errors than longitudinal design permits.

The chapter has carefully reviewed EA methodology: its importance to this study, its development, its limitations and its specific application to Chinese word order errors. It has identified a research procedure of four stages: sample collection, error identification, error description and error explanation. The factors that influence errors that learners make (medium, genre and content) have been specified for the sampling of the present study. Word order error criteria have been shown to comprise both ungrammaticality and inappropriateness. It has also been shown that explicit description and specific explanation of Chinese word order errors can be better achieved by employing Chinese word order principles (and sub-principles), a particularized intralingual approach, rather than relying on the described four available error sources, namely interlingual, intralingual, teaching-induced and communication-strategy-based.

The following chapter records the details of the participant cohort, data corpus and data analysis procedures employed in this study.

Chapter Five: The Study

In order to examine how adequate the proposed criterion, that is, violation of any basic word order principle (or sub-principle), will be in categorizing Chinese L2 word order errors, a sample of learners' written production data will be collected and a corpus of Chinese L2 word order errors extracted. This chapter presents the data collection and data analysis procedures employed for these purposes.

1. Data collection

This section presents the details of participants and data corpus. The participants comprised 116 L2 learners of Chinese from three proficiency levels. Written production data, with three different genres, various topics and different sample lengths, was collected. Details are provided below.

1.1. Participants

Participants in the study were students who were enrolled in the Chinese language program at The University of Queensland, Australia. The sample comprised 116 students from three different proficiency levels based on their institutional status: level 1 (first year, $n = 30$), level 2 (second year, $n = 53$) and level 3 (third year, $n = 33$). They were all native-English-speaking Chinese L2 learners with males and females of roughly the same proportion.

The level 1 students had no previous knowledge of Chinese language (true beginners) before they enrolled. Written and spoken Chinese are offered as separate courses in this university. Learners received 6 hours teaching per week, 4 hours in spoken and 2 hours in written for two semesters of 13 weeks. For the written course, the first semester concentrated on character recognition, production (about 280 characters in total) and learning to read simple dialogues. The objectives for second

semester included using a dictionary, constructing sentences, translating short passages and composing short narrative passages.

The level 2 students had completed year one Chinese or achieved equivalent proficiency as judged by the course convener. They received 7 hours teaching per week, 4 hours in spoken and 3 hours in written, for two 13-week semesters. The main objectives for the written course included employing contextual and associational strategies to manage unfamiliar language, translating passages from Chinese into English and composing narratives and letters in colloquial language.

The level 3 students had completed two years of Chinese courses or achieved equivalent proficiency as judged by the course convener. They received 6 hours teaching per week, 3 hours in spoken and 3 hours in written, for two 13-week semesters. The main objectives for the written course included using dictionaries skillfully, learning meanings of radicals, using Chinese punctuation marks and composing different genres of writing such as essays and reports.

1.2. Written production data

Written production data from the three proficiency levels was collected during February 2003 to September 2004. Three genres of data were gathered: (1) letter; (2) web-diary; and (3) essay. It is desirable for this research project to include data that enables both some comparability between different proficiency levels (same genre and topic) and varieties in genre and topic to provide various word order errors. The letter genre with a topic of dinner party or dining experience was collected from all three proficiency levels (though a 'compromise' letter from level 1) in order to have some comparability between the proficiency levels, while the student web-diary genre was collected from level 2, and the essay genre was collected from level 1 and level 3 in order to attain some genre and topic varieties. Details of the written genres from the three levels are described as follows:

1.2.1. Letter

To ensure the comparability of written samples between different proficiency levels, a writing task of the same genre and topic for all proficiency levels is required. It was decided to employ, for the data collection of this project, a letter-writing task involving inviting a friend to a dinner party. However, since the level 1 students were not sufficiently

competent to write a full letter, their task was simplified to a certain extent. Details are described below.

Level 1: Due to their inability to write an entire invitation letter for a dinner party, the level 1 students were requested to write a passage. A dining experience was considered as the closest topic to a dinner party for the passage. The learners were required to recount one of their dining experiences to a friend, that is, to write the passage in a letter tone. This passage-writing task was included in a closed book examination in June 2004. It accounted for 20% of the examination marks. Forty-two students attended the examination. However, twelve of them were native speakers of other languages than English. Given that this study examines only word order errors made by native-English-speaking learners of Chinese, the 12 copies were excluded. Thirty copies of valid written samples were collected from native English-speaking learners.

Level 2: A letter-writing task involving inviting a friend to a dinner party with specific requirements was included in an examination paper in June 2004. The requirements were: In the letter please state (1) why you're having the dinner; (2) the exact time of the dinner; (3) your new address and how to get there from her/his place; (4) who else is coming; and (5) a special dish you've planned for dinner. Fifty-three valid written samples were collected.

Level 3: The same letter-writing task was also included in a mid-semester examination for the level 3 students in September 2004. Twelve valid samples were collected. In order to collect more written samples from level 3 students, an information sheet plus a consent sheet for the research project were made available to other students enrolled in level 3 through their teachers. Twenty-one students participated in the task. Each provided a written sample (also a letter with the same requirements). Altogether, a total of 33 valid written samples were collected from level 3 students.

In total, 116 letters from Chinese L2 learners of three proficiency levels were collected for this study (note: including the passages written by the level 1 students).

1.2.2. Web-diary

Level 2: Chinese second year students were required to write a diary entry of about 60 characters in length every week for 10 weeks to be posted on their course website. The content of the diary entry was decided by the students with one requirement that there needed to be

some coherence or continuation between weekly entries. The diary samples were collected from two groups of students (only native-English-speaking learners were included): one (n = 12) enrolled from February to June 2003 and the other (n = 14) enrolled from February to June 2004. Altogether, the diary samples comprised approximately 14 000 characters.

1.2.3. Essay

Level 1: As an assignment, Chinese first year students were required to write a self-introduction in Chinese of approximately 130–150 characters in length. Only native English-speaking learners' (n = 33) written samples were included in the data corpus. Altogether, the samples collected comprised approximately 4500 characters.

Level 3: Twenty-three written samples were collected from three written assignments. One required comment on a book read recently by students (n = 9), another required description of a cartoon picture regarding Chinese parents' attitude towards their children's education (n = 8) and the third required description of a trip to Beijing (n = 5). Altogether, the essay written samples collected from this level comprised approximately 5000 characters.

Table 5.1 summarizes the data corpus in terms of proficiency levels, genre, topic and length by characters.

Table 5.1 Summary of data corpus from Chinese L2 learners

Level	**Genre**	**Topic**	**Length in Characters**
Level 1	Letter, essay	Dining experience, self-introduction	6056
Level 2	Letter, diary	Invitation to dinner party, various	21 164
Level 3	Letter, essay	Invitation to dinner party, comment on a self-chosen book, description of a cartoon picture, and trip to Beijing.	10 529
Total			37 749

2. Data analysis

This section identifies the unit of analysis for the present study and specifies the procedural sequence carried out in data processing, based on the data corpus summarized above in Table 5.1.

2.1. Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis is a *sentence*. This choice is based not only on previous EA studies but also on a comparison between T-unit analysis[8] and sentence analysis. EA studies, both in English L2 from Corder (1967) to James (1998) and in Chinese L2 from Lu (1984) to Ko (1997), have all exclusively employed a *sentence* as the unit of analysis. Moreover, the *sentence* has advantages over alternative units such as clause or T-unit in relation to a qualitative description of the syntactic complexity of L2 performance (for elaboration see Bardovi-Harlig, 1992). For these reasons, a *sentence* is chosen as the unit for analyzing the written samples collected in this study.

2.2. Procedure of analysis

Corder (1981, p. 23) proposes an elaborate procedure for identifying errors, which is also recounted in Ellis (1994, p. 53). Ellis has criticized Corder's error-identification procedure in its distinctions between errors and mistakes and overt and covert errors as well as in its reliance on the learner as an "authoritative" informant providing intended meaning of his/her erroneous sentences, as discussed earlier in Chapter Four (see pp. 121–126). Learners are not always available to researchers, on the one hand, and on the other hand, they are not always capable of this task.

In the present study, among various types of errors, only word order errors need to be identified. With the help of Chinese word order principles and sub-principles listed in Table 3.9 (p. 86) as guiding lines, the complexity of error identification is considerably reduced. In addition, word order "represents the most overtly noticeable feature of cross-linguistic syntax" (Tomlin, 1986, p. 1). This means that native speakers are particularly sensitive to any deviation in word order from that of their NL. Word order error identification in this study, therefore, follows the procedure below:

(1) Each written sample was read carefully as an entire text. Each sentence in a written sample was examined according to two criteria: grammaticality and appropriateness, focusing on word order only.

8. T-unit refers to "the shortest units into which a piece of discourse can be cut without leaving any sentence fragments as residue" (Hunt, 1970, p. 188). Generally, average T-unit length increases when the proficiency of the discourse increases while average sentence length does not correlate to proficiency level.

(2) Sentences that were deemed ungrammatical or inappropriate in terms of word order were singled out.
(3) Sentences with word order errors were classified according to Ko's (1997) categories, as listed in Table 3.4 (see p. 72).
(4) Sentences with word order errors were then classified according to violation of a relevant word order principle or sub-principle, as listed in Table 3.9 (see p. 86).

Steps (3) and (4) compared the two taxonomies presented in Chapter 3 to see how adequate the respective approaches are for covering Chinese L2 word order errors collected in this study.

These steps (1–4) were undertaken independently by the researcher and another trained Chinese native-speaking rater on 20% of the data corpus. Inter-rater reliability was calculated to show the reliability of the two raters' interpretation of learners' Chinese L2 performance in regard to word order errors.

3. Conclusion

This chapter has reported the data collection and analysis details. The first section has described the participant cohorts and data corpus. Altogether 116 learners of Chinese from three different proficiency levels at The University of Queensland, Australia participated in this study. The genre of the data includes letter, web-diary and essay. The topics include invitation to a dinner party, self-introduction, commentary on a book, trip to Beijing and self-chosen ones.

The second section has identified 'sentence' as the most appropriate unit of analysis and has reported the data analytical procedure, that is, (i) identify word order errors with the help of the two word order error criteria discussed earlier (see p. 124); (ii) develop a word order error corpus by collecting the word order errors in each written sample; and (iii) compare the classification of errors in the corpus according to Ko's three categories with the classification according to violated word order principles and sub-principles.

The following chapter revisits the research questions and reports the results of data analysis.

Chapter Six: A principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors

The principal aim of this project is to develop a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. Chapter One identified the problem of describing and explaining Chinese L2 word order errors and raised six research questions. Chapter Two established a theoretical framework, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach, to explore these research questions raised. Guided by this theoretical framework, Chapter Three reviewed studies on Chinese L2 word order acquisition, word order error taxonomies and Chinese word order principles (and sub-principles) for the present study to build on. Through the review, Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy appears to be extendable by employing a newly proposed criterion, that is, violation of any word order principle or sub-principle, in categorizing Chinese word order errors.

Chapter Four determined how data should be collected and analyzed in order to compare the classification of Chinese word order errors according to Ko's three categories with the classification according to violated word order principles and sub-principles. Chapter Five presented the details of the participants; data corpus; data collecting procedure; and data analytical procedure. This chapter presents the results of the data analysis and documents the development of a new taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors.

This chapter consists of four sections. The first section serves as an introduction by revisiting the research questions raised in Chapter One and restating the findings of the literature review chapters. The second section presents the classification of Chinese L2 word order errors collected in this study according to Ko's taxonomy, which further demonstrates its limitedness and the need for a new method of categorization of the word order errors collected. The third section presents the classification of Chinese L2 word order errors collected in this study according to violated word order principles and sub-principles and documents the development of a new taxonomy by combining useful categories in the existing taxonomy with new categories emerging from the data. The final section identifies the characteristics of the new taxonomy and discusses its significance in order to enhance understanding of the taxonomy.

1. Introduction

This section links the research questions raised in Chapter One, the findings of earlier chapters and the results from data analysis. It firstly revisits the research questions. It then restates the earlier findings resulting from the literature review.

1.1. Revisiting research questions

The first chapter of this book has raised six research questions (see p. 15). The first three questions have been answered by reviewing the literature. The final three questions remain to be answered. Question 4 is addressed in section 2, question 5 is addressed in section 3 of this chapter and question 6 is addressed in Chapter Seven. All questions are revisited below:

1. *What Chinese L2 word order error taxonomies are available to date?*

This question has been answered in section 2, Chapter Three, by reviewing Chinese L2 word order error studies. Ko's (1997) word order error taxonomy has been determined as the starting point for developing a more comprehensive taxonomy.

2. *Are the categories in existing taxonomies theoretically motivated?*

As discussed in Chapter Three (see pp. 72–75), the categories in Ko's word order error taxonomy have only limited theoretical motivation. This study has identified a theoretical framework, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach, as an informative framework for understanding Chinese L2 word order errors and motivating the categories used to describe these errors.

3. *How can existing taxonomic categories be modified so as to better account for Chinese L2 word order errors?*

In section 5 of Chapter Three, it has been proposed that the existing taxonomic categories be extended by categorizing word order errors with a new criterion, that is, violation of any word order principle or subprinciple. Chapter Six here presents the percentage of word order errors collected in this study that can be categorized by using this criterion.

4. *How adequately do existing Chinese L2 word order error taxonomies account for the data collected in this study?*

This question is answered in the second section of this chapter.

5. *Drawing on a proposed taxonomic framework, what categories of word order errors are made by Chinese L2 learners in this study?*

This question is answered in the third section of this chapter.

6. *What are the relative frequencies of occurrence of various Chinese word order errors in this study?*

This question is answered in Chapter Seven.

1.2. Restatement of earlier findings

In order to relate the data to the findings from earlier chapters, it is useful to restate those findings here. The literature review driven by the research questions discussed above resulted in two specific questions:

(1) How adequate is Ko's (1997) taxonomy for describing word order errors made by Chinese L2 learners in this study?
(2) What percentage of the collected word order errors can be categorized by the newly proposed criterion, namely violation of any word order principle or sub-principle?

To answer question (1), Ko's taxonomy needs to be applied to the data. To answer question (2), the word order principles and sub-principles summarized in Table 3.9 (see p. 86) need to be examined with the data. For the sake of convenience, Table 3.9 is re-presented below.

As discussed in Chapter Three, word order principle number 1 (PTS), number 2 (WBP), number 7 (MBH), and sub-principles 1.1 (Action Series), 1.2 (Locative Expressions) and 1.5 (Modifier of the Verb) listed in Table 3.9 above all have high explanatory value for the relevant word order error categories emerging from the literature, as listed in Table 3.5 (p. 76). In other words, violation of any of these principles and sub-principles respectively leads to the categorized word order errors that are listed in Table 3.5. Before the word order errors collected in this study are categorized by using this new criterion, Ko's taxonomy is examined first.

Table 3.9 Chinese word order principles and sub-principles from literature

Domain	Principle	Sub-principle
Conceptual	1. Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS)	1.1 Action Series 1.2 Locative Expressions 1.3 Time Expressions 1.4 the Beneficiary/Concerned 1.5 Modifiers of the Verb 1.6 Subsidiary Relations
	2. Whole-Before-Part (WBP)	2.1 Temporal Scope
	3. Container-Before-Contained (CBC)	
	4. Trajector-Landmark (TL)	
Functional	5. Principle of Communicative Dynamism (PCD)	
	6. Principle of Focus (PF)	
Grammatical	7. Modifier-Before-Head (MBH)	
	8. Empathetic Principle (EP)	

2. Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy

Based on the written samples collected for this study, altogether 408 sentences with word order errors were extracted. Employing Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy, of the 408 word order errors only 165 can be categorized, leaving 243 in the miscellaneous category. The number and percentage of categorized word order errors are shown in Table 6.1. The numbers in brackets are from Ko's study, which are listed here for the purpose of comparison.

Table 6.1 Number and percentage of word order errors according to Ko's taxonomy

Category	No. of errors		Percentage (%)	
Time and Place Words	113	(48)	28	(36)
Modification Structures	38	(14)	9	(10)
Topic-comment Relations	14	(26)	3	(19)
Miscellaneous	243	(47)	60	(35)
Total	408	(135)	100	(100)

As shown in Table 6.1, 243 (60%) word order errors are excluded from Ko's (1997) three-category taxonomy. This demonstrates that Ko's framework is too limited, although it provides important basic elements for a more complete taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors.

In comparison with Ko's (1997) study, this study has collected more word order errors, approximately three times as many. In the first category, namely Time and Place Words, the error percentage of Ko's is moderately higher (36% versus 28%). Most likely this is because she used oral production data (the Oral Proficiency Interview) while this study used written production data. People may refer to time and place more frequently in oral than in written communication, especially when they talk about their personal experiences.

In the second category, namely Modification Structures, the percentages are similar in the two studies (10% versus 9%). It seems that the proportion of modification structures people employ in speech is similar to that in written communication.

In the third category, namely Topic-comment Relations, Ko's percentage is much higher (19% versus 3%). The most likely reason is that Ko's participants used more topic-comment structures in their interviews, hence creating more chances for errors. Two factors could have contributed to the use by Ko's participants of more topic-comment structures. One is the data type and the other is L2 culture contact. First, Ko used oral data while this study used written data. In oral communication, people tend to mention their topics first because they can always add other information easily. By contrast, in written communication, people tend to package information into integrated structures (Chafe, 1982) (see p. 153). That is why spoken language tends to employ more topic-comment structures. Second, the participants in the present study had little opportunity for contact with a Chinese culture while Ko's participants did. In Ko's (1997) own words: "Some of the subjects had overseas experience, primarily in Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and China. Some of them had ethnic Chinese backgrounds and could have communicated at home in different Chinese dialects with their parents" (p. 46). So, compared with Ko's participants, the adult learners of Chinese in the present study could be more influenced by their subject-predicate L1 (English) when producing written L2.

In the Miscellaneous category, the percentage of word order errors in the present study is much higher (60% versus 35%). This shows that Ko's taxonomy accounts for only a portion of the word order errors produced by the participants in this study. This may be due to the difference in language mode under investigation. Ko examined oral produc-

tion, while the study here focused on written errors. It may also be due to the language learning context. The participants in the present study had very limited contact with the target culture. A further possibility for the difference may be in the language proficiency of the participants in the respective studies. Ko examined interview data from learners at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels, while the present study examined learners also from three proficiency levels depending on year of study (see Chapter Five). It cannot be ascertained whether there were significant differences in proficiency since no comparable proficiency scores are available. However, with the apparently wider range of proficiency levels reported in Ko's study, one might expect a wider range of error types, not a narrower one as was evident in the results above.

The preceding discussion has answered research question no. 4 "*How adequately do existing Chinese L2 word order error taxonomies account for the data collected in this study?*" The existing taxonomy is too limited to account for the data collected. In order to develop a more comprehensive taxonomy, the 408 word order errors collected need to be re-categorized according to the new criterion proposed in this study. The sole criterion is: violation of any basic word order principle or sub-principle. This re-categorization is presented below.

3. A principle-based taxonomy of word order errors

This section presents a new taxonomy for the categorization of Chinese word order errors. It examines the adequacy of the newly proposed criterion, that is, violation of any word order principle or sub-principle, in categorizing Chinese word order errors. Based on the word order principle taxonomy presented in Table 3.9, further refinement of the categories is provided.

This section consists of six sub-sections. The first sub-section reports the inter-rater reliability in order to examine consistency between the two raters' data analysis in this study. The second sub-section discusses the need for further refinement of the categories used. The third sub-section discusses the existing categories. The fourth sub-section presents the new categories emerging from the data and introduces, explains and demonstrates each of the new categories. The fifth sub-section discusses the word order errors excluded, namely the 'Other' category. The final sub-section presents the newly developed principle-based taxonomy.

As mentioned in Chapter Four (see p. 126), in order to enhance the validity of data interpretation and analysis, the author and a trained

native-speaking rater independently analyzed 20% of the written samples collected, which will be referred to as test samples. The inter-rater reliability of the test samples is reported below.

3.1. Inter-rater reliability

The data analysis consists of two fundamental steps. One is word order error identification and the other is word order error categorization. The author and the trained native-Chinese-speaking rater analyzed 20% of the data independently for both error identification and categorization. The test samples were selected randomly, including 6 'letters' out of a total of 30 and 6 self-introduction essays out of a total of 33 from level 1; 10 letters out of a total of 53 and 46 diary entries out of a total of 232 from level 2; and 6 letters out of a total of 33, 2 book-commentary essays out of a total of 9, 1 cartoon-picture essay out of a total of 8 and 1 trip-to-Beijing essay out of a total of 5 from level 3. The inter-rater reliability for word order error identification and word order error categorization in the test samples was calculated, respectively.

3.1.1. Inter-rater reliability: word order error identification

Initially, one rater identified 80 word order errors while the other rater identified 75. Between the two groups of word order errors, 73 were identical. After discussion, there was consensus on 79 word order errors. Therefore, the inter-rater reliability of word order error identification was 92.4% (73/79).

3.1.2. Inter-rater reliability: word order error categorization

Categorization of the 79 word order errors identified in the test samples was conducted after the categories in the new taxonomy were identified. Each of the 79 word order errors was carefully examined, diagnosed and categorized independently by the two raters according to a relevant principle or sub-principle it violates. Seventy-four were categorized identically by the two raters independently. Therefore, the inter-rater reliability of word order error categorization was 93.7% (74/79).

3.2. Need for further refinement of word order error types

While categorizing the word order errors identified according to violation of any basic principle or sub-principle listed in Table 3.9, both raters found that:

(1) the existing categories of word order principles could not cover all the word order errors identified. For example, the Topic-comment Relation errors are not covered by any of the existing principle categories. Thus, the scope of the current principle categories requires extension.
(2) under some word order principle categories, different groups of word order errors were found. For example, four different groups of word order errors all violate Whole-Before-Part (WBP) principle. One single principle, namely WBP, could not explain the error differences between these four groups. This indicates that the scope of sub-principle categories needs to be extended.
(3) further differences in the word order errors under some sub-principle categories were discovered. Therefore, in order to achieve greater explicitness in the description of word order errors under some of the sub-principle categories, 'sub-principle type' categories were supplemented where necessary.

During the categorization process of the 79 word order errors, both the author and the native-speaking rater thus found it necessary to create new categories to cover the range of word order errors extracted from the data. These new categories are highlighted in Table 6.2 below and will be discussed in section 3.4.

Drawing on the experience gained in analyzing the test samples, the author then analyzed the remaining 80% of the data and identified 329 word order errors. In total 408 word order errors were extracted from the entire data corpus from learners at three proficiency levels based on institutional status: 58 from level 1, 205 from level 2 and 145 from level 3. Among the 408 word order errors collected, 404 were successfully categorized according to the violation of a basic word order principle or a sub-principle or a sub-principle type. Four word order errors were excluded from the categories and classified into the 'Other' category.

After careful examination of all the categories, it was determined that the principles in the grammatical domain constitute the most basic principles because they are the only ones that are likely to appear in grammar books and, as such, should be presented first. Taking this into account, the categories were re-arranged.

Table 6.2 below presents the resulting categories of word order errors including both existing and newly emerging categories. The categories presented in regular font are existing categories that are equivalent to those categories presented in Table 3.9. The categories presented in bold font are newly emerging categories. Following a discussion of the

existing categories, the new categories will be introduced, explained and demonstrated in light of the expanded taxonomy.

Table 6.2 Existing and newly emerging word order error categories

Domain	Principle	Sub-principle	Sub-principle type
Grammatical	**1. GPP***	**1.1 Question** **1.2 Topic-comment**	
	2. MBH	**2.1 Modifier + N** **2.2 *De* Position**	
Conceptual	3. PTS	3.1 Action Series	**3.1.1 Natural Iconicity** **3.1.2 Conceptual Iconicity** **3.1.3 Direction + Action** **3.1.4 LE Position**
		3.2 Locative Expressions	**3.2.1 Location + V** **3.2.2 V + Place**
		3.3 Time Expressions	**3.3.1 Time + V** **3.3.2 V + Time** **3.3.3 Duration + *Mei* + V**
		3.4 Beneficiary	
		3.5 Modifiers of V.	**3.5.1 Adv. + V** **3.5.2 V + Adv.**
		3.6 Subsidiary Relations	
	4. WBP	4.1 Temporal Scope	
		4.2 Spatial Scope	
		4.3 Time + Space + Manner + V.	
		4.4 General + Particular	
	5. CBC		
	6. TL		
Functional	7. PCD		
	8. PF		
Sociocultural	9. EP		
Other			

*GPP: The Greenberg Pattern Principle; MBH: The Principle of Modifier Before Head; PTS: The Principle of Temporal Sequence; WBP: The Principle of Whole Before Part; CBC: The Principle of Container-Before-Contained; TL: The Principle of Trajector-Landmark; PCD: The Principle of Communicative Dynamism; PF: The Principle of Focus; EP: The Empathetic Principle

3.3. The existing categories

As shown in Table 6.2, the existing categories include three domains, eight principles and seven sub-principles. Various numbers of word order errors were found in these categories (details of the error rates are provided in Chapter Seven), except the Trajector-Landmark (TL) (principle no. 6 in Table 6.2) category, in which no word order error was found. This finding is not surprising given that the TL principle is not unique to Chinese. English also observes this principle. The Chinese and English word orders in the two examples (48) and (49) given on page 120, which demonstrate the TL principle, are exactly the same. Non-appearance of error in the TL category, thus, is likely due to L1 positive transfer.

The CBC (principle no. 5 in Table 6.2) category is found to cover the same range of structures as the newly established Spatial Scope sub-principle (4.2 in Table 6.2) category. The former requires that the 'Container' precede the 'Contained' and the latter requires that a more general scope of space precede a more particular scope of space in Chinese word order arrangement (for details, see p. 95 and p. 161). The 'Container' can be considered as a more general scope of space while the 'Contained' a more particular scope of space. Thus, the CBC principle category becomes redundant in the new taxonomy.

Therefore, except for the TL principle category and the CBC principle category, all the remaining existing categories, that is, three domains, six principles and seven sub-principles, are considered to be important elements in building a more comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors.

3.4. New categories emerging from the data

As shown in Table 6.2, the bold highlighted categories are the ones emerging from the data. Building on the existing categories discussed above, the following new categories emerged:

(1) A new domain: the Sociocultural domain;
(2) A new principle: the Greenberg Pattern Principle;
(3) Seven new word order sub-principles;
(4) Eleven word order sub-principle types.

These new categories are discussed below according to the layers of domain, principle, sub-principle and sub-principle type. For conve-

nience, each of the sub-principles and sub-principle types is referred to by the number preceding their titles, as shown in Table 6.2.

3.4.1. A new domain: the Sociocultural domain

Hu (1995) maintained that Chinese word order principles fall within different domains. As shown in Table 3.6 (p. 84), he identified the three domains as conceptual, functional and grammatical. However, the Empathetic Principle (EP) is excluded from all three domains. Careful examination of how EP governs Chinese word order (for examples, see Chapter Three, p. 104) shows that, among sequences of two juxtaposed kinship terms, some word order sequences in Chinese are consistent with that of their English counterparts and some are not. The data of this study shows that word order here is socio-culturally governed. For example, in referring to one's parents, the word order is *Baba Mama* (Dad and Mum) in Chinese but it is *Mum and Dad* in English. EP functions at a socio-cultural level, therefore, this principle is categorized under a 'Sociocultural' domain in this study.

In this domain, six word order errors were found. All of them occurred most likely due to the different sociocultural conventions in Chinese and English for addressing one's parents and grandparents. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 54–56 and 259–261. Take error no. 259 as example (73):

(73a) ＃我 **妈妈 爸爸** 想 去 看望 我 **婆婆 和 公公**
Wo mama baba xiang qu kanwang wo popo he gonggong
和 **奶奶 和 爷爷**。
he nainai he yeye.

I Dad Mum want go see I maternal grandma and grandpa and paternal grandma and grandpa

My Mum and Dad would like to visit my maternal and paternal grandparents.

(73b) 我 **爸爸 妈妈** 想 去 看望 我 **公公 婆婆**
Wo baba mama xiang qu kanwang wo gonggong popo
和 **爷爷 奶奶**。
he yeye nainai.

I Dad Mum want go see I maternal grandma grandpa and paternal grandma grandpa

My Mum and Dad would like to visit my maternal and paternal grandparents.

As shown in (73b), conventionally, Chinese follows male + female order while English follows female + male order in referring to one's parents and grandparents. Sentence (73a) violates the EP principle in Chinese: it is erroneous due to sociocultural inappropriateness.

3.4.2. A new principle: the Greenberg Pattern Principle (GPP)

The Greenberg Pattern Principle is a new principle which falls within the grammatical domain. As discussed earlier (p. 102), grammatical principles refer to those principles that manifest themselves mainly through syntactic rules (Hu, 1995). The other grammatical principle is called the Modifier-Before-Head (MBH), as listed in Table 3.9. *The Greenberg Pattern Principle* prescribes what word order/orders should be permissible in Chinese. This notion is generally known as 'canonical word order'. The name *Greenberg Pattern Principle* (GPP) is proposed here to specify the principle governing canonical word order in Chinese. It was Greenberg (1963, 1966) who set up the basic word order typology for natural languages. Three sets of criteria were used. One of them is the relative order of subject (S), verb (V) and object (O) in declarative sentences with nominal subject and object. Thirty languages from different families were investigated, which were subsequently classified into three common types: SVO, SOV and VSO. Greenberg (1966) maintains that the vast majority of languages have several variant orders but a single dominant one. Mention was made earlier in Chapter One that it has been a matter of heated debate whether the dominant/canonical word order in Chinese is SVO or SOV. Based on the latest literature, the GPP for Mandarin Chinese can be summarized as follows: (a) statistically, the predominant word order is SVO (Chu, 1998; Ho, 1993; Sun and Givon, 1985); (b) SOV and OSV word orders are entirely permissible, but are used for contrastive purposes, that is, to emphasize, mark as prominent or definite, or otherwise draw attention to or "set off" the object (McGinnis, 1988, p. 53); and (c) OV and VO patterns are grammatically correct because in Mandarin Chinese there is no need to state the subject when it is obvious (Chu, 1998). Examples in (74) show that SVO, SOV, OSV, OV and VO are all grammatically correct sentences in Chinese:

(74a) 我 洗 衣服 了。 (SVO)
Wo xi yifu le.
I wash clothes LE
I washed my clothes.

(74b) 我 把 衣服 洗 了。 (SOV)
Wo ba yifu xi le.
I *Ba* clothes wash LE
I washed my clothes.

(74c) 衣服 我 洗 了。 (OSV)
Yifu wo xi le.
Clothes I wash LE
Clothes, I washed them.

(74d) 衣服 洗 了。 (OV)
Yifu xi le.
Clothes wash LE
Clothes, (I) washed them.

(74e) 洗 衣服 了。 (VO)
Xi yifu le.
Wash clothes LE
(I) washed (my) clothes.

Among the above five word order patterns, the learners in this study particularly favoured the SVO pattern, as shown in (74a). The majority of sentences from their written samples were SVO structures (although the exact percentage was not calculated because the focus of this study is on word order errors). This prevalence could be due to L1 transfer since English is a rigid SVO language (Cohen, 1998). Word order patterns like (74b) and (74c) were rarely found in the data, which may be because SOV and OSV do not occur as often in English as in Chinese. Word order patterns like (74d) and (74e) were also very rarely found in the data, which could be because OV and VO are simply grammatically incorrect in English.

Twenty one word order errors were found in the data that fall within this GPP category. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 1–5, 59–65 and 267–272. Take error no. 4 as example (75) below:

(75a) *Canberra 有 小 人口。
Canberra you xiao renkou.
Canberra have small population
Canberra has a small population.

(75b) 堪培拉 人口 很 少。
Kanpeila renkou hen shao.
Canberra population very small
Canberra has a small population.

As shown in (75a), the L2 learner used an SVO structure in expressing the meaning in Chinese that is conventionally expressed by a topic-comment structure, as shown in (75b). A topic is what a sentence is about and a comment is what is said about the topic (Hu, 1995). The topic in (75) is *Kanpeila* 'Canberra' while the comment is *renkou hen shao* 'population very small'. A verb (V) is not an essential constituent in a topic-comment structure in Chinese, as shown in (75b), although many topic-comment structures do contain verbs. The OSV word order structure in Chinese, as shown above in (74c), is actually one type of topic-comment structure.

Under the GPP category, the L2 learners in this study had particular difficulty in producing correct/appropriate word order in topic-comment and question structures. The word orders in these structures have been conventionalized as grammar rules in Chinese. Thus, the Topic-comment and Question categories emerging from the data are considered to be two sub-principle categories under the GPP category (grammatical domain). Details are provided below.

3.4.3. Seven new sub-principles

As shown in Table 6.2, two new sub-principles emerged from the data under GPP discussed above. They are named 1.1 Question and 1.2 Topic-comment. Another two sub-principles emerged from the data under the Modifier-Before-Head (MBH) principle category. They are named 2.1 Modifier + N and 2.2 *De* Position. Three new sub-principles emerged under the Whole-Before-Part (WBP) category. They are named 4.2 Spatial Scope, 4.3 Time + Place + Manner + V and 4.4 General + Particular. For details of MBH and WBP, please refer to Chapter Three (see p. 102 and p. 94). All seven new sub-principles are discussed below.

Question sub-principle (1.1)

In order to make clear how this sub-principle governs Chinese word order, it is compared with its English counterpart. Interrogation in English is usually characterized by means of inversion or a change in word order. However, in Chinese, the word orders of statements and corresponding questions remain the same.

There are two basic types of questions in English: Yes-No questions and Wh-questions.

(1) Yes-No questions. When an English sentence contains the copula 'be' or an auxiliary (e.g. will, can, may), the 'be' or the auxiliary is placed at the front of the sentence in order to form a Yes-No question. If there is no 'be' or auxiliary in a statement, the auxiliary 'do' must be introduced at the initial position for a Yes-No question. To form a Yes-No question in Chinese, the order of the subject and the verb remains the same as that in a statement, but the sentence-final question marker '*ma*' is added. For example:

In English (statement)	Jane is her best friend.
(question)	Is Jane her best friend?
In Chinese (statement)	珍妮 是 她 最好 的 朋友。
	Zhenni shi ta zuihao de pengyou.
	Jane is she best friend
	Jane is her best friend.
(question)	珍妮 是 她 最好 的 朋友 吗?
	Zhenni shi ta zuihao de pengyou ma?
	Jane is she best friend *ma*
	Is Jane her best friend?

(2) Wh-questions. Unlike Yes-No questions, in which the whole proposition is being questioned, only "a specific constituent or constituents in the underlying sentence are being questioned in wh-questions, that is, the speaker/writer is asking the listener/reader to fill an information gap in a given sentence" (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 147). As far as word order is concerned, the structure of a Chinese wh-question matches the structure of its corresponding statement. That is to say, the position of the information gap is filled by one of the 'wh' words. In English, 'wh' words are almost always placed at the initial position of sentences. A comparison of wh-questions of English and Chinese follows:

a. Wh-questions that focus on the subject noun phrase (NP) or the determiner of the subject NP: For this type of wh-questions, English and Chinese share the same word order, as shown in the following examples:

English: Who broke the window?

Chinese: 谁 打 破 了 窗子?
Shei da po le chuangzi?
Who hit break LE window
Who broke the window?

English: Whose key is lost?

Chinese: 谁的 钥匙 丢 了?
Shei de yaoshi diu le?
Whose key lose LE
Whose key is lost?

b. Wh-questions that focus on any element of the sentence apart from subject, for example, object: the word orders differ in English and Chinese, as shown in the following examples:

b1. Object NP
English: What did you eat?

Chinese: 你 吃 了 什么?
Ni chi le shenme?
You eat LE what
What did you eat?

b2. Object of a preposition
English: Who did you come with?

Chinese: 你 跟 谁 来 的?
Ni gen shei lai de?
You with who come DE
Who did you come with?

b3. Adverbial of place
English: Where do you live?

Chinese: 你 住 哪儿?
Ni zhu nar?
You live where
Where do you live?

b4. Adverbial of time
English: When do you want to come?
Chinese: 你 想 什么 时候 来?
Ni xiang shenme shihou lai?
You want what time come?
When/what time do you want to come?

b5. Intensifier
English: How much did you pay?
Chinese: 你 付 了 多少 钱?
Ni fu le duoshao qian?
You pay LE how much money
How much did you pay?

As shown above, for Yes-No questions, the word orders in English and Chinese are different. For wh-questions, the word orders in English and Chinese are similar in some cases but different in others. English and Chinese share the same word order for wh-questions that focus on the subject NP or the determiner of the subject NP. For other categories, wh-fronting and subject/auxiliary inversion are involved in English but not in Chinese. This can be confusing for English learners of Chinese.

Under the Question sub-principle category, six word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 1–2, 59, and 264–266. Take error no. 266 as example (76) below:

(76a) *你 知道 日记 **什么** 写 吗?
Ni zhidao riji ***shenme*** *xie ma?*
You know diary what write *ma*
Do you know what to write for the diary?

(76b) 你 知道 日记 写 **什么** 吗?
Ni zhidao riji xie ***shenme*** *ma?*
You know diary write what *ma*
Do you know what to write for the diary?

As shown above, *xie shenme* (literally 'write what') in (76b) was replaced by *shenme xie* (literally 'what write') by the learner in (76a). This occurred most likely due to the influence of L1 word order 'what to write', as shown in the English translation. Example (76a) is errone-

ous because it violates the Question sub-principle in that wh-fronting is required in English but not in Chinese.

Topic-comment sub-principle (1.2)

Compared with English, one of the distinctive features of Chinese is the existence of many topic-comment sentences. As discussed earlier (see p. 195), there are different types of topic-comment structures in Chinese. Sentence (77) is an example of a common topic-comment structure.

(77) 这 地方 可以 跳舞。
Zhe difang keyi tiaowu.
this place can dance
One can dance at this place.
Topic comment

This sentence sounds very natural to a Chinese ear. However, it may sound odd to native-English-speaking learners because 'this place' cannot be the subject/agent of 'dance'. Even very advanced learners rarely produce such sentences.

In a noun-verb-noun (NVN) structure, if the second N is moved to the initial position of the sentence, such a word order, namely NNV, usually "corresponds to a particular discourse-related meaning" (Li & Thompson, 1985, p. 518). For example, in (74a), *Wo xi yifu le* (NVN) (I have washed clothes) is talking about what I have done. In (74c) *Yifu wo xi le* (NNV, or OSV) (Clothes, I have washed them), *Yifu* is the topic, *wo* is subject and *xi* is the verb (*le* being a particle that indicates the action has been completed). This word order is used when the speaker and listener had mentioned *Yifu* (clothes) earlier and it implies that both the speaker and the listener had agreed before the sentence was uttered that the *yifu* (clothes) needed to be washed. Similar examples abound in Chinese. The sentence *Shu wo huan le* (NNV) (The book, I have returned) implies that both the speaker and the listener had known the book or had talked about it before the sentence was uttered. The NNV order (or OSV structure) is another typical topic-comment structure in Chinese. According to Cognitive Functionalist Grammar, as mentioned in Chapter Two (p. 70), the more prototypical the noun or verb is, the more flexibility it can have in word order arrangement and the more likely it can be involved in a topic-comment structure, namely an NNV order. Only very advanced learners are capable of using this kind of structure (Xie, 1992). Moreover, the meaning

conveyed by the change of word order, namely from NVN to NNV, is often missed by L2 learners of Chinese.

Under the Topic-comment sub-principle category (grammatical domain), 15 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 3–5, 60–65, and 267–272. Take error no. 60 as example (78) below:

(78a) *我 男朋友 有 好 的 脾气。
Wo nanpengyou you hao de piqi.
I boyfriend have good temper
My boyfriend has a good temperament.

(78b) 我 男朋友 脾气 很 好。
Wo nanpengyou piqi hen hao.
I boyfriend temper very good
My boyfriend has a good temperament.

This example shows that the learner used an SVO word order in (78a) for a sentence that is conventionally expressed with a topic-comment structure in Chinese, as shown in (78b). In (78b), *wo nanpengyou* 'my boyfriend' is the topic and *piqi hen hao* 'temperament very good' is the comment about 'my boyfriend'. Sentence (78a) violates the Topic-comment sub-principle and that is why it is erroneous.

Modifier + N sub-principle (2.1)

Modifier + *N* stands for the word order of a modifier and the noun it modifies. This sub-principle requires that a modifier precede the noun it modifies in Chinese no matter whether the modifier is an adjective, an attributive clause, a prepositional phrase, a gerund or an infinitive verb phrase. Usually the possessive particle *de* connects a modifier and the noun it modifies. For example, in the sentence *Zai Yingguo gongzuo de jiejie lai kan wo le* 'My sister who works in the UK has come to see me', *Zai Yingguo gongzuo* is an attributive clause that precedes the noun *jiejie* that it modifies. *De* is used to connect the two parts.

Under this sub-principle category (grammatical domain), 24 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 10–11, 72–82 and 277–287. Take error no. 10 as example (79) below:

(79a) *我 是 服务员 的 日本 饭店。
Wo shi fuwuyuan de Riben fandian.
I is waitress *de* Japan restaurant
I am a waitress at a Japanese restaurant.

(79b) 我 是 日本 饭店 的 服务员。
Wo shi Riben fandian de fuwuyuan.
I is Japan restaurant *de* waitress
I am a waitress at a Japanese restaurant.

Sentence (79a) does not make sense because its word order violates the Modifier + N sub-principle in that *Riben fandian de* 'at a Japanese restaurant' is a modifier and should be positioned before the noun *fuwuyuan* 'waitress', as shown in (79b).

In the sentence *Zhe shi ge xue zhongwen de hao jihui* 'This is a good opportunity to learn Chinese', *xue zhongwen* (indefinite verb, 'to learn Chinese') and *hao* (adjective, 'good') both are modifiers of the noun *jihui*, so they both precede the noun *jihui*. Thus, the Modifier + N sub-principle is strictly observed. However, two questions arise: (1) why is there only one *de* while there are two modifiers? (2) why does *de* follow *zhongwen* but not *hao*? These questions are addressed in the *De* Position sub-principle below.

De Position sub-principle (2.2)

This sub-principle (under the grammatical domain) accounts for the number of possessive particles *de* and their positions in a sentence when more than one modifier occurs before a N. Normally only one *de* is required when a sentence includes two modifiers regardless of whether they are a pronoun and an adjective or two adjectives or other types of modifiers. The position of *de* is usually determined by the conceptual relations existing between sentence constituents. As Haiman (1983) states: "The linguistic distance between expressions corresponds to the conceptual distance between them" (p. 782). Some evidence of distance motivation from Chinese syntax is presented by Tai (1993), which includes the presence and absence of particle *de* between the modifier and the modified, and between the possessor and the possessed. In those constructions the absence of *de* expresses closer or intimate relationship while the presence of *de* signals a relationship that is not very close or not between people. For example, *lao pengyou* means 'friends of long standing', while *lao de pengyou* means 'friends of old age'. When referring to family members, relatives, or friends, *de* is usually omitted as in *wo mama* 'my mum' instead of *wo de mama*. However, *de* is often used when we mention our pets or our inanimate possessions, as in *wo de gou* 'my dog' instead of *wo gou* and *wo de shubao* 'my schoolbag' instead of *wo shubao*. Therefore, the presence/absence of *de* is determined by the

semantic relationship between the pronoun or adjective and the noun it modifies. In the sentence *Houtian shi wo gege de shengri* (The day after tomorrow is my brother's birthday), semantically *wo* and *gege* have a close relationship. Therefore, *de* is dropped after *wo* (I) yet retained after *gege* (brother).

In addition, *de* is usually dropped after a single character adjective like *xin* (new) or *hao* (good). For example, 'clean clothes' is expressed by *ganjing de yifu* where *de* is retained while 'new clothes' is expressed by *xin yifu* where *de* is dropped. This explains why *de* is absent after *hao* in the sentence mentioned above: *Zhe shi ge xue zhongwen de hao jihui*.

Under this sub-principle category, 14 word order errors were found. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 6–9, 66–71 and 273–276. Take error no. 273 as example (80) below:

(80a) *她 有 长 的 金色 头发。
Ta you chang de jinse toufa.
She has long *de* blonde hair
She has long blonde hair.

(80b) 她 有 金色 的 长 头发。
Ta you jinse de chang toufa.
She has blonde long hair
She has long blonde hair.

As discussed above, *de* is usually dropped after a single character adjective. That is why *de* is absent after *chang* 'long', as shown in (80b). In addition, *chang* is a qualitative adjective to describe one's hair and semantically closer to *toufa* 'hair' than the colour adjective *jinse de* 'blonde'. That is why *chang* is positioned closer to *toufa*, as shown in (80b). Sentence (80a) violates the *De* Position sub-principle and hence, it constitutes an error.

Spatial Scope sub-principle (4.2)

This sub-principle (under the conceptual domain) requires that a more general scope of space precede a more particular scope of space in Chinese word order arrangement. The way of writing one's address is a good example. If a person lives at *12 Nanjing Road, Shanghai, China*, the equivalent address in Chinese will be *Zhongguo Shanghai Nanjing lu shier hao* (literally China, Shanghai, Nanjing Road, 12).

Thus, Chinese and English approach spatial scope very differently: the former from general to particular and the latter from particular to general. The following two examples also demonstrate this sub-principle and the difference in the two languages: *Women de fangzi you san ge fangjian* (There are three rooms in our house) and *Diqiu shang you hen duo guojia* (There are many countries on Earth), where the single underlined constituents refer to bigger spatial scopes than the double underlined ones.

Under this sub-principle category, 27 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 52, 219–232 and 378–389. Take error no. 52 as example (81) below:

(81a) *现 在 我 住 布里斯本 澳大利亚。
Xian zai wo zhu Bulisiben Aodaliya.
Now I live Brisbane Australia
Now I live in Brisbane, Australia.

(81b) 现 在 我 住 澳大利亚 布里斯本。
Xian zai wo zhu Aodaliya Bulisiben.
Now I live Australia Brisbane
Now I live in Brisbane, Australia.

In (81), *Aodaliya* 'Australia' refers to a bigger spatial scope, namely a country, than *Bulisiben* 'Brisbane', which is a city in the country. Chinese requires that *Aodaliya* precede *Bulisiben* while English requires that *Aodaliya* follow *Bulisiben* in word order arrangement. Sentence (81a) violates the Spatial Scope sub-principle in Chinese and that is why it is erroneous.

Time + Place + Manner + V sub-principle (4.3)

This sub-principle (under the conceptual domain) refers to the word order sequence of adverbials when all three types of adverbials occur in one sentence. Normally the adverbial of Time precedes the adverbial of Place and both of them precede the adverbial of Manner. The reason for this order is that "time, being intangible and omnipresent, is generally conceived of holding a larger scope than place, which is concrete and localized" (Ho, 1993, p. 167). Manner is even more particular than place. For example, in the sentence *Wo pengyou meitian zai jiali dasheng de du yingwen* (My friend reads English loudly everyday at home), *meitian* (everyday) is the adverbial of Time that precedes the adverbial of Place *zai jia li* (at home), followed by the adverbial of Manner *dasheng*

de (loudly). All of the adverbials must precede the verb, as discussed in the *Modifiers of V sub-principle* (see p. 117). The word order of adverbials in English is different, as shown in the translation. It should be noted that the above example is cited to demonstrate the order sequence of the three types of adverbials when they all occur in one sentence. In practice, one adverbial occurs most often, followed by two adverbials, while three are quite rare. When two adverbials occur at the same time, three possible word orders apply in Chinese: Time precedes Place, Time precedes Manner, or Place precedes Manner.

Under this sub-principle category, 12 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 233–239 and 390–394. Take error no. 390 as example (82) below:

(82a) *在 前 大门 上午 十一点 我们 见面。
Zai qian damen shangwu shiyidian women jianmian.
At front gate morning 11.00 we see each other
We'll see each other at 11.00 am at the front gate.

(82b) 我们 上午 十一点 在 前 大门 见面。
Women shangwu shiyidian zai qian damen jianmian.
We morning 11.00 at front gate see each other
We'll see each other at 11.00 am at the front gate.

As shown above, example (82) contains two adverbials: *shangwu shiyidian* '11.00 am' is an adverbial of Time while *zai qian damen* 'at the front gate' is an adverbial of Place. The Time + Place + Manner + V sub-principle requires Time precede Place and both precede the verb. Sentence (82a) violates this sub-principle and hence, it is erroneous.

General + Particular sub-principle (4.4)

This sub-principle (under the conceptual domain) refers to word order arrangements that fall within the WBP category yet are not covered by the other three sub-principles 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 under WBP, as listed in Table 6.2. This sub-principle requires that a larger amount precede a smaller amount; a superordinate entity precede a lower level entity; an issue precede an aspect of this issue and so forth. In the sentence *Wo de ji ge pengyou lai Beijing le* (Several of my friends have come to Beijing), the noun *pengyou* (friends) is modified by both *wo de* (my) and *ji ge* (several). The reason that *wo de* precedes *ji ge* is because *wo* 'I' can have many friends and *ji ge* is only 'part' of 'my friends'.

Under this sub-principle category, 11 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 52, 240–247 and 395–396. Take error no. 52 as example (83):

(83a) *我 做完 两 个作业 有 三 个.
Wo zuowan liang ge zuoye you san ge.
I do finish two M assignment have three M
I have finished two of my three assignments.

(83b) 我 有 三 个作业, 做完 两 个了.
Wo you san ge zuoye, zuowan liang ge le.
I have three M assignment, do finish two M le
I have finished two of my three assignments.

Example (83) above is talking about the total number of assignments and how many of them have been finished. The General + Particular sub-principle requires that the total number, which is *san ge* 'three', precede the number of assignments having been finished, which is *liang ge* 'two', as shown in (83b). Sentence (83a) is erroneous because it violates this sub-principle.

3.4.4. Eleven new sub-principle types

As discussed in Chapter Three (p. 87), the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) requires the word order of linguistic structures follow the temporal order of states that they represent. Under this principle, Ho (1993) categorized six sub-principles, which were named 3.1 Action Series, 3.2 Locative Expressions, 3.3 Time Expressions, 3.4 Beneficiary, 3.5 Modifiers of V and 3.6 Subsidiary Relations, as shown in Table 6.2 (p. 149). Eleven new sub-principle types emerged from the data under four (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5) of the six sub-principles. In the following, the eleven sub-principle types are discussed.

Action Series sub-principle type 1: Natural Iconicity (3.1.1)

Natural Iconicity, one of the four Action Series sub-principle types, determines that the word order in a sentence follows the action series sequence that the words represent. In other words, what happens earlier syntactically precedes what happens later. This is the basic tenet in PTS. In the sentence *Wo zuotian xia ke hou qu kan dianying le* (I went to see a movie after class yesterday), for example, the action *xia ke* (finish class) took place earlier than the action *qu kan dianying* (go to see a movie). Thus, *xia ke* precedes *qu kan dianying* syntactically in word order

arrangement in the sentence. English does not strictly observe this type of sub-principle, as shown in the English translation.

Under this sub-principle type category, 10 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 12–13, 83–89 and 288. Take error no. 288 as example (84) below:

(84a) #我 妈妈 是 老师, 她 每天 从 家 到 学校 开车。
Wo mama shi laosi, ta meitian cong *jia dao xuexiao kaiche*.
I Mum is teacher, she everyday from home arrive school drive
My Mum is a teacher and she drives from home to school every day.

(84b) 我 妈妈 是 老师, 她 每天 从 家 开车 到 学校。
Wo mama shi laosi, ta meitian cong jia kaiche dao xuexiao.
I Mum is teacher, she everyday from home drive arrive school
My Mum is a teacher and she drives from home to school every day.

In (84), the action represented by *kaiche* 'drive' takes place before the action represented by *dao xuexiao* 'arrive school' for *Mama* 'Mum', so *kaiche* precedes *dao xuexiao*, as shown in (84b). Sentence (84a) violates the Natural Iconicity sub-principle type and that is why it constitutes a word order error.

Action Series sub-principle type 2: Conceptual Iconicity (3.1.2)

As the second of the four Action Series sub-principle types, *Conceptual Iconicity* determines the word order for action series that happen conceptually: what conceptually appears earlier to one's mind precedes what appears later. For example, in the sentence *Wo jia li daxue bu yuan* (My home is not far from the University), *wo jia* (my home) appears conceptually first to the speaker, followed by *daxue* (university). A comment *bu yuan* (not far) only occurs after thinking of the distance between the two places. The word order of a sentence follows *Conceptual Iconicity* in Chinese, but not in English (see English translation).

Under this category, 21 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 14, 90–101 and 289–296. Take error no. 101 as example (85) below:

(85a) *我 和 他 承诺[约好] 遇见 互相[相见] **在 中国**。
Wo he ta yuehao yujian xiang hu zai Zhongguo.
I and he promise meet each other in China
He and I promised to meet each other in China.

(85b) 我 和 他 约好 **在 中国** 相见。
Wo he ta yuehao zai Zhongguo xiang jian.
I and he promise in China meet each other
He and I promised to meet each other in China.

In example (85), the two people ('he and I') need to go to China first, and then it is possible for them to meet each other there. *Zai Zhongguo* 'in China' conceptually appears to them before *xiangjian* 'meet each other' when they were planning to do so. Therefore, z*ai Zhongguo* needs to precede *xiangjian* in word order arrangement, as shown in (85b). Sentence (85a) is erroneous because it violates this *Conceptual Iconicity* sub-principle type.

Action Series sub-principle type 3: Direction + Action (3.1.3)

Direction + Action, the third of the four Action Series sub-principle types, determines the word order of directional action phrases such as *zuo guai* (literally left turn), *you guai* (literally right turn) and *chu qu* (literally out go), where the direction word (left, right, out) precedes the action word (turn, go) in Chinese. The rationale for this word order lies in the fact that one does not carry out the action of "turning" or "going" before a direction of "right" or "left" is decided. In other words, people decide the direction before the action takes place. Thus, conceptually, direction instruction appears in one's mind earlier than the action instruction. That is why in Chinese direction words like *zuo* (left) and *you* (right) precede action words like *guai* (turn) and *qu* (go). Similar to the two types discussed above, English does not observe this type of Action Series sub-principle either.

Under this category, 17 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 15–16, 102–109 and 297–303. Take error no. 297 as example (86) below:

(86a) *一 个 警卫 **来** 向 我。
Yi ge jingwei lai xiang wo.
One security officer come towards me
A security officer came to me.

(86b) 一 个 警卫 向 我 [走] **来**。
Yi ge jingwei xiang wo zou lai.
One security officer towards me walk come
A security officer came to me.

In (86), *xiang wo* 'towards me' indicates the direction of the action of *lai* 'come'. This *Direction + Action* sub-principle type requires that *xiang wo* precede *lai* in Chinese, as shown in (86b). Sentence (86a) is erroneous because it violates this Action Series sub-principle type.

Action Series sub-principle type 4: *Le* Position (3.1.4)

As the fourth of the four Action Series sub-principle type, *Le Position* requires that a verb *le*[9] should be positioned after the second verb in sentences where two verbs/actions are involved, in order to indicate both actions have been completed. For example, in the sentence *Women qu pa le Changcheng* (We went climbing the Great Wall), *qu* (go) is an action and *pa* (climb) is another action. When both actions *qu* and *pa* have been completed, *le* follows the second action, or can be positioned at the end of the sentence. However, *le* cannot be positioned after the first verb/action *qu* (go) because if *le* follows the first verb *qu*, it cannot indicate the completion of the second action pa.

Under the Le Position sub-principle type category, seven word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 17, 110–114, and 304. Take error no. 304 as example (87) below:

(87a) *在 北京 的 时候 我们 去 了 参观 颐和园。
Zai Beijing de shihou women qu ***le*** *canguan yiheyuan.*
At *Beijing de* time we go **LE** visit the Summer Place
We went to visit the Summer Place while we were in Beijing.

(87b) 在 北京 的 时候 我们 去 参观 了 颐和园。
Zai Beijing de shihou women qu canguan ***le*** *yiheyuan.*
At *Beijing de* time we go visit LE the Summer Place
We went to visit the Summer Place while we were in Beijing.

(87c) 在 北京 的 时候 我们 去 参观 颐和园 了。
Zai Beijing de shihou women qu canguan yiheyuan ***le****.*
At *Beijing de* time we go visit the Summer Place **LE**
We went to visit the Summer Place while we were in Beijing.

In (87), there are two verbs/actions. One is *qu* (go) and the other is *canguan* (visit). Both actions have been completed. The *Le Position* sub-principle type requires that *le* either follow the second verb *canguan,*

9. *Le* is a particle that has various functions in Chinese. One of its functions is to indicate completion of an action, for which it is positioned either after a verb or at the end of a sentence. The *le* that follows a verb is called a verb *le* and the *le* that is positioned at the end of a sentence is called a sentence *le*.

as shown in (87b), or be positioned at the end of the sentence, as shown in (87c). Sentence (87a) is regarded as erroneous because it violates this sub-principle type.

The four sub-principle types discussed above all observe the *Action Series* sub-principle in that, if there is more than one action in a Chinese sentence, the action that happens earlier (no matter earlier in reality or conceptually) precedes the one that happens later (Ho, 1993).

Locative Expressions sub-principle type 1: Location + V (3.2.1)

Location + V, one of the two Locative Expressions sub-principle types, determines that a locative expression precedes a verb where the location denoted by the locative expression represents an earlier temporal state than the action denoted by the verb. In other words, the 'action' takes place in the 'location' because the location exists before the action. For example, in the sentence *Wo qu tushuguan jie shu* (I go to the library to borrow some books), *tushuguan* (library) is the location and the verb phrase *jie shu* (borrow book) follows *tushuguan*. This indicates that the action of 'borrowing books' happens in the location of 'library'. *Wo* (I) must be physically in the library before the action of 'borrowing books' happens.

Under this *Location + V* sub-principle type category, 26 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 18–20, 115–132 and 305–309. Take error no. 305 as example (88) below:

(88a) *我 学习 在 布里斯本。
Wo xuexi zai Bulisiben.
I study in Brisbane
I am studying in Brisbane.

(88b) 我 在 布里斯本 学习。
Wo zai Bulisiben xuexi.
I in Brisbane study
I am studying in Brisbane.

In (88), the action denoted by the verb *xuexi* 'studying' happens in the scope of the location *Bulisiben* 'Brisbane'. The *Location + V* sub-principle type requires that *Bulisiben* precede *xuexi*, as shown in (88b). Sentence (88a) is an error because it violates this sub-principle type.

Locative Expressions sub-principle type 2: V + Location (3.2.2)

As another of the two Locative Expressions sub-principle types, *V + Location* determines that a locative expression follows a verb where

the location denoted by the locative expression resulted from the action denoted by the verb. In other words, the action happens before the location is reached. For example, in the same sentence mentioned above *Wo qu tushuguan jie shu* (I go to library to borrow some books), the location *tushuguan* follows the verb *qu* (go). This indicates that the location *tushuguan* is a result of the action *qu*. English usually also observes this sub-principle type, as shown in the translation.

Under this *V + Location* category, seven word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 21 and 133–138. Take error no. 138 as example (89) below:

(89a) ＃我 喝 醉 了, 就 在 马路 边 **睡** 了。
Wo he zui le, jiu zai malu bian shui le.
I drink drunk LE, then at street sleep LE
I was drunk and then slept on the street.

(89b) 我 喝 醉 了, 就 **睡** 在 马路 边 了。
Wo he zui le, jiu shui zai malu bian le.
I drink drunk LE, then sleep at street LE
I was drunk and then slept on the street.

Example (89) is very interesting in that both (89a) and (89b) are grammatically correct sentences. However, (89a) is inappropriate in the context (a student was describing one of his drinking experiences) because the location *zai malu bian* resulted from the action *shui* due to 'my' drunkenness. So, *zai malu bian* needs to follow *shui*, as shown in (89b). In (89a), *zai malu bian* precedes *shui*, which means that the person decided to sleep on the street deliberately. In this context, the person was drunk and not in a state to be able to decide where to sleep. Therefore, (89a) is inappropriate because it violates the *V + Location* sub-principle type.

The two sub-principle types discussed above, namely 3.2.1 *Location + V* and 3.2.2. *V + Location*, observe the *Locative Expressions* sub-principle that governs the word order of a locative expression and a verb in a sentence. Since a locative expression can occur both pre-verbally and post-verbally, the above two sub-principle types specify the different meaning conveyed by a pre-verbal and a post-verbal locative expression.

Time Expressions sub-principle type 1: Time + V (3.3.1)

Time + V, one of the three Time Expressions sub-principle types, determines that a time expression precedes a V where the time expression

represents a temporal state that happens earlier than the action denoted by the verb. Punctual time often represents an earlier temporal state than a V, therefore, punctual time is often positioned before V. For example, in the sentence *Wo zaoshang qi dian qichuang* (I get up at 7.00 am in the morning), *zaoshang qi dian* (7.00 am in the morning) is a punctual time that represents an earlier temporal state than the V *qichuang* (get up), hence, *zaoshang qi dian* precedes *qichuang* syntactically.

Under this *Time + V* category, 34 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 22–27, 139–161 and 310–314. Take error no. 161 as example (90) below:

(90a) *我们 看 电影 明天 晚上 六点 半。
Women kan dianying mingtian wanshang liu dian ban.
We see film tomorrow evening six thirty
We are going to see a film at six thirty tomorrow evening.

(90b) 我们 明天 晚上 六点 半 看 电影。
Women mingtian wanshang liu dian ban kan dianying.
We tomorrow evening six thirty see film
We are going to see a film at six thirty tomorrow evening.

In (90), *mingtian wanshang liu dian ban* 'at 6.30 pm tomorrow' is a punctual time and the action *kan dianying* 'to see a film' will not start until the set time '6.30 pm tomorrow'. In this case, the *Time + V* sub-principle type in Chinese requires that the action *kan dianying* follow the time expression *mingtian wanshang liu dian ban*, as shown in (90b). Sentence (90a) is an error because it violates this type of Time Expressions sub-principle.

Time Expressions sub-principle type 2: V + Time (3.3.2)

As the second of the three Time Expressions sub-principle types, *V + Time* determines the word order that a time expression follows a V where the time expression is a result of the action denoted by the verb or shows how long the action lasts. In other words, the action starts before the time is counted. For example, in the sentence *Ta ku le yi ge xiaoshi* (She cried for an hour), the action *ku* (cry) started before the time was counted and the action *ku* lasted for *yi ge xiaoshi* (an hour). That is why *yi ge xiaoshi* follows *ku* syntactically.

Under the V + Time category, 27 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 28-35, 162–176 and 315–318. Take error no. 28 as example (91) below:

(91a) *我们　一十八 年　住　英国。
Women yishiba nian zhu Yingguo.
We eighteen years live the UK
We spent eighteen years living in the UK.

(91b) 我们　住　在 英国　十八 年。
Women zhu zai Yingguo shiba nian.
We live in the UK eighteen years
We spent eighteen years living in the UK.

In (91), the temporal duration *shiba nian* 'eighteen years' is a result of the action *zhu (zai)* 'living'. In this case, the *V + Time* sub-principle type requires that *shiba nian* follow *zhu (zai)*, as shown in (91b). Sentence (91a) is erroneous because it violates this Time Expression sub-principle type.

It is not absolute that punctual time precedes V and temporal duration follows V. The position of a time expression, before or after a V, respectively depends on whether it represents an earlier temporal state than the V or it is a result of the action denoted by the V.

Time Expressions sub-principle type 3: Duration + *Mei (you)* + V (3.3.3)

Duration + Mei(you) + V, the final of the three Time Expressions sub-principle types, determines that the word order observes Duration + *Mei(you)* + V order when a temporal duration is employed in a sentence that indicates negation. For example, in the sentence *Wo san ge xingqi mei jian ni le* (I haven't seen you for three weeks), the temporal duration *san ge xing qi* (three weeks) is followed by the negation word *mei* (not), which in turn is followed by the verb *jian* (see). The rationale for this word order lies in the fact that the action denoted by the verb *jian* (see) did not take place after *san ge xingqi* (three weeks) passing by. Thus, the action *jian* needs to follow *mei,* which in turn needs to follow the temporal duration *san ge xingqi*.

Under this category, seven word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 177–178 and 319–323. Take error no. 177 as example (92) below:

(92a) *我　不[没] 见　你　多[好几个] 月。
Wo mei jian ni haoyige yue.
I not see you several months
I haven't seen you for several months.

(92b) 我 好 几个 月 没 见 你 了。
Wo hao jige yue mei jian ni le.
I several months not see you LE
I haven't seen you for several months.

In (92), the action *jian ni* 'see you' did not take place until after *hao jige yue* 'several months' had passed by. In this case, the *Duration + Mei (you) + V* sub-principle type requires that *hao jige yue* be followed by the negation word *mei* and be further followed by the verb phrase *jian ni*, as shown in (92b). Sentence (92a) violates this type of Time Expressions sub-principle and that is why it is erroneous.

The three Time Expressions sub-principle types, namely *Time + V*, *V + Time* and *Duration + mei(you) + V*, all observe the *Time Expressions* sub-principle. They specify the word order arrangements catering for the different semantic relations between a V and a time expression in a sentence.

Modifiers of V sub-principle type 1: Adv + V (3.5.1)

As one of the two Modifiers of V sub-principle types, *Adv + V* requires that an adverb precede a V where the adverb functions as an adverbial indicating the manner of the verb. The adverbial indicator *de* (地) often connects the adverbial and the verb, though it can be omitted sometimes. For example, in the sentence *Ta shengqi de guan le diannao* (She turned the computer off angrily), *shengqi de* (angrily) is an adverbial indicating the manner of her action *guan diannao* (turn off computer). It indicates that 'she' was angry before 'she' decided to turn off the computer.

Under this *Adv + V* category, 51 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 43–48, 182–209 and 336–346. Take error no. 346 as example (93) below:

(93a) *至于 我 的 中文， 我 必须 学习 **努力**。
Zhiyu wo de zhongwen, wo bixu xuexi nuli.
As for my Chinese, I must study hard
As for my Chinese, I must study hard.

(93b) 至于 我 的 中文， 我 必须 **努力**地 学习。
Zhiyu wo de zhongwen, wo bixu nuli(de) xuexi.
As for my Chinese, I must hard study
As for my Chinese, I must study hard.

In (93), *nuli* 'hard' is an adverbial indicating the manner of the action denoted by *xuexi* 'study'. The speaker decides how s/he would like to study. In this case, the *Adv* + *V* sub-principle type requires that *nuli* precede *xuexi,* as shown in (93b). Sentence (93a) is erroneous because it violates this type of Modifiers + V sub-principle.

Modifiers + V sub-principle type 2: V + Adv (3.5.2)

V + *Adv*, another of the two Modifier of V sub-principle types, determines that an adverb follows a V where the adverb functions as a complement indicating the resultant state from the action denoted by the verb. The complement indicator *de* (得) connects the verb and the adverb. For example, in the sentence *Wo chi de tai bao le* (I am so full after eating), *tai bao* (so full) is the complement indicating a state resulting from the action chi (eat).

Under this V + Adv category, 11 word order errors were found in the data. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 210–212 and 347–354. Take error no. 349 as example (94) below:

(94a) *上次 事故他没有 很 严重 地受 伤。
Shangci shigu ta meiyou hen yanzhong de shou shang.
Last time accident he not have very seriously hurt
In the accident last time he was hurt, not very seriously though.

(94b) 上次 事故他受伤 伤 得不严重。
Shangci shigu ta shoushang shang de bu yanzhong.
Last time accident he receive hurt hurt *de* not seriously
In the accident last time he was hurt, not very seriously though.

In (94), the action *shoushang* 'being hurt' took place before it was known how serious the 'hurt' was. In other words, *bu yanzhong* 'not seriously' is a complement or a resultant state of the action denoted by the verb *shoushang*. In this case, the *V* + *Adv* sub-principle type requires that *bu yanzhong* follow *shoushang*, as shown in (94b). Sentence (94a) is an error because it violates this type of Modifiers + V sub-principle.

The above two sub-principle types specify the different semantic relations between a verb and its modifiers, which has been discussed under the Modifiers of V sub-principle earlier in Chapter Three (p. 92).

Thus, all the newly emerged categories have been explained and demonstrated with examples. They include one new domain; one principle; seven new sub-principles; and eleven new sub-principle types. However, four word order errors are excluded from all the existing and newly

emerged categories. They are classified as an 'Other' category. In the following, details of this category are provided.

3.5. The Other category

As mentioned earlier, among the 408 word order errors extracted from the data, some failed to be categorized according to the violation of any basic word order principle or sub-principle. They were classified into the Other category. Specifically, four word order errors were found in the Other category. Questions arise as to (1) what kind of word order errors they are; and (2) why they are left out. In order to answer these two questions, the four word order errors are discussed below.

The four word order errors can be further classified into two types. See Appendix (p. 231), error nos. 57–58 and 262–263. The first type includes errors nos. 57 and 262. The second type includes errors nos. 58 and 263. Each type will be discussed in more detail below.

The first type of word order error occurred most likely due to different conceptualizations in English and Chinese in conveying the notion that 'somebody does a certain job'. The English structure "subject + work as + job title" is conveyed differently in Chinese as "subject + do + job title + job". Take error no. 57 as example (95):

(95a) *我 女朋友 工 作 中学 老师。
Wo nü pengyou gong zuo zhongxue laoshi.
I girlfriend work high school teacher
My girlfriend works as a high school teacher.

(95b) 我 女朋友 做 中学 老师 工作。
Wo nü pengyou zuo zhongxue laoshi gongzuo.
I girlfriend do high school teacher job
My girlfriend works as a high school teacher.

Sentence (95a) is erroneous; however, it does not violate any of the principles or sub-principles discussed earlier. That is why it was excluded from all the categories of domains, principles, sub-principles and sub-principle types listed in Table 6.2.

The second type of word order error occurred due to the fact that some verb phrases in Chinese, such as *banjia* 'move house' or *shuijiao* 'sleep' allow the insertion of a frequency measure word like *yici* or *yi* 'once' to form new phrases such as *ban yici jia* 'move house for one time' or *shui yi jiao* 'sleep for a while'. However, in English, 'move house' does not allow the insertion of a frequency measure phrase 'for

one time', which has to follow 'move house' in the word order arrangement. Similarly, the word 'sleep' does not allow any insertions in English. The phrase 'for a while' has to follow the word 'sleep' to convey the meaning s*hui yi jiao*. Being influenced by their L1 English, the learners tend to say *banjia yi ci* for 'move house for one time' and *shui-jiao yixiar* for 'sleep for a while', which are erroneous in Chinese. Take error no. 58 as example (96):

(96a) *我们 决定 搬家 一 次。
Women jueding banjia yi ci.
We decide move home once
We have decided to move house for one time.

(96b) 我们 决定 搬 一 次 家。
Women jueding ban yi ci jia.
We decide move once home
We have decided to move house for one time.

Sentence (96a) does not violate any of the principles, sub-principles or sub-principle types listed in Table 6.2 although it is erroneous in Chinese. That is the reason that it was excluded from all the identified categories.

3.6. The taxonomy

Any taxonomy can have exceptions or include a miscellaneous category, yet, a good taxonomy keeps the miscellaneous category to a minimum. Given that only four (0.98%) word order errors were excluded from the categories identified, these categories are considered to comprise a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. This new taxonomy consists of the important elements from the existing categories and the newly emerging categories discussed above. Table 6.3 below presents the newly developed taxonomy, namely the principle-based taxonomy.

Compared with Table 6.2, Table 6.3 includes slightly fewer categories because the following two categories in Table 6.2 are excluded: 5. CBC and 6. TL. The category of 5. CBC is redundant because it covers the same range of word order errors as 4.2 Spatial Scope does. The category of 6. TL is excluded because no errors occurred in this category.

As shown in Table 6.3, this new principle-based taxonomy consists of categories of four layers with each layer being a broader category than the next from left to right. It includes categories of four domains, seven principles, fourteen sub-principles and eleven sub-principle types.

Table 6.3 A principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors

Domain	Principle	Sub-principle	Sub-principle type
Grammatical	1. GPP*	1.1 Question 1.2 Topic-comment	
	2. MBH	2.1 Modifier + N 2.2 *De* Position	
Conceptual	3. PTS	3.1 Action Series	3.1.1 Natural Iconicity 3.1.2 Conceptual Iconicity 3.1.3 Action Direction 3.1.4 LE Position
		3.2 Locative Expressions	3.2.3 Location + V 3.2.4 V + Location
		3.3 Time Expressions	3.3.1 Time + V 3.3.2 V + Time 3.3.3 Duration + *Mei(you)* + V
		3.4 Beneficiary	
		3.5 Modifiers of V.	3.5.1 Adv. + V 3.5.2 V + Adv.
		3.6 Subsidiary Relations	
	4. WBP	4.1 Temporal Scope	
		4.2 Spatial Scope	
		4.3 Time + Space + Manner + V.	
		4.4 General + Particular	
Functional	5. PCD		
	6. PF		
Sociocultural	7. EP		
Other			

*GPP: The Greenberg Pattern Principle; MBH: The Principle of Modifier Before Head; PTS: The Principle of Temporal Sequence; WBP: The Principle of Whole Before Part; PCD: The Principle of Communicative Dynamism; PF: The Principle of Focus; EP: The Empathetic Principle

With this new taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors being developed, the fifth research question "*Drawing on a proposed taxonomic framework, what categories of word order errors are made by Chinese L2 learners in this study?*" has been answered. Among the 408 identified word order errors, 404 (99%) were categorized using the sole criterion proposed. In order to facilitate understanding of the new taxonomy, its characteristics and significance are discussed below.

4. Characteristics and significance of the new taxonomy

This section firstly discusses the characteristics of the newly developed taxonomy. It then addresses its significance as determined by its characteristics. Finally, this section demonstrates that Chinese word order errors can be specifically explained by employing this taxonomy.

4.1. Characteristics of the principle-based taxonomy

The principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors was developed by categorizing word order errors according to the violation of a relevant word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type. It is built on the existing categories from the literature by incorporating new categories emerging from the data of this study. It is determined to have the following distinguishing characteristics:

(1) The new taxonomy has a theoretical base, namely Cognitive Functionalist Approach. According to this approach, Chinese word order principles (and sub-principles) reflect Chinese native speakers' conceptualization of the real world, such as space and time, categorization and iconicity. This imposes constraints on Chinese linguistic word order (Biq et al., 1996).
(2) Compared with Ko's taxonomy, the new taxonomy covers a larger range of Chinese L2 word order errors. It extends existing word order error taxonomies identified in the literature, as shown in Table 3.5 (p. 76).
(3) The new taxonomy was developed by relying on a sole criterion, that is, the violation of any basic word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type. Through this categorization, existing categories and newly emerged categories are incorporated into one system.

(4) The new taxonomy can explain not only why a word order error is in fact an error, but can also explain why a correct word order form is correct. In other words, better explanation of Chinese word order arrangement has been achieved through the new taxonomy, and moreover, the exact causes of most word order errors can also be determined. It is actually a taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors as well as a taxonomy of the core operating system that governs written Chinese word order and its variations.
(5) The taxonomy provides a sense of order because more specific categories are incorporated into more general categories. Moreover, the relationship between all the word order error categories is clearly shown through the taxonomy.
(6) The new taxonomy is an open-ended rather than a closed system. This means that new categories can be added as necessary. It embraces extensive testing and possible revising when different sampling is involved, for example, utilizing participants with higher proficiency levels, or eliciting different written tasks or different genres. In short, in no way is it to be regarded as an unalterable taxonomy.

4.2. Significance of the new taxonomy

For the purpose of describing errors, three error taxonomies have been reviewed in Chapter Four (see pp. 127–128), that is, the Surface Strategy, the Linguistic Category and the Systematicity Taxonomy. The Surface Strategy taxonomy is considered to be superficial because it only describes the surface features of errors such as omission and addition. Corder's Systematicity Taxonomy, while promising in shedding light on how learners learn an L2, is difficult to put into practice. The Linguistic Category taxonomy is considered to be extendable. Ko (1997) employed the Linguistic Category approach in her taxonomy (see Table 3.4, p. 72). She extended the linguistic category of word order errors by developing three sub-categories (see Table 3.3, p. 71). However, no consistent criteria were found for developing the categories of Ko's taxonomy. So her taxonomy is considered non-systematic.

The principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors developed in this study overcomes the limitations mentioned above. It has a theoretical base, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach, which indicates that it is not superficial. New categories were elicited from the

research data. This demonstrates that the taxonomy is empirically testable and practical since little difficulty is found in putting it into practice. It is also systematic since it was developed by using a sole criterion, namely the violation of any basic word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type. Through this categorization, more explicit description and clearer explanation of Chinese L2 word order errors can be achieved.

This new taxonomy can also be utilized for teaching purposes, since Chinese word order phenomena can be more clearly described and Chinese L2 word order errors can be more specifically explained. This has opened up opportunities for more effective measures to be taken to improve Chinese L2 word order teaching and error correction feedback.

4.3. Explanation for Chinese L2 word order errors

As discussed earlier (see Chapter Four, p. 129), explanation of errors is an important stage for SLA research because it is concerned with establishing the source of L2 errors. Four sources of errors have been identified in the literature: interlingual, intralingual, teaching induced and communication-strategy-based (see p. 129). However, these error sources are too general to account for different types of Chinese L2 word order errors. This study adopts a particularized intralingual approach, that is, employing the violation of a basic Chinese word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type to explain various word order errors.

Referring back to examples (7) and (8) given in Chapter One (see p. 13), (7a) #*Ni keyi lai zuo huoche* 'You can come by train' and (8a) **Women kaishi wu dian* 'We begin at five o'clock' constitute Chinese word order errors. Although they can be explained by 'L1 transfer' or as 'interlingual errors', such explanations provide no insight as to how Chinese word order functions in relation to these sentence structures. Moreover, such explanations are not effective for instruction because they provide no explanation to learners of Chinese as to the different characteristics of the above word order errors and how to correct them. Therefore, Chinese L2 learners would still be left in the dark as to how Chinese functions in relation to the corresponding correct word order structures.

The principle-based taxonomy developed in this study can provide a more specific and more effective explanation to learners of Chinese in relation to their L2 word order errors. According to the Cognitive Func-

tionalist Approach, adult L2 learners' conceptualization of the world is initially based on their L1. Moreover, L1-based conceptualization does not change immediately or easily when learners start learning L2. Their conceptualization of the world imposes constraints on their L2 language use. Therefore, errors occur when English learners of Chinese apply their conceptualization derived from the English language and cultural experience to Chinese structures. So, in addition to L2 forms, such as vocabulary, learners also need to acquire the conceptualization based on the L2. In terms of Chinese word order, the word order principles (and sub-principles) are the reflections of Chinese conceptualization of the world. Violation of any of these word order principles (or sub-principles) inevitably leads to a word order error.

Using the new taxonomy, (7a) *#Ni keyi lai zuo huoche* 'You can come by train' constitutes a word order error because this sentence violates principle no. 3, PTS, more specifically sub-principle 3.1 Action Series, yet more specifically Action Series sub-principle type 2: Conceptual Iconicity (3.1.2). This sub-principle type requires that the action *zuo huoche* 'take train' precede the action *lai* 'come' because the person must 'take train' first and then 'come' here. Thus, the correct form should be *Ni keyi zuo huoche lai*, as shown in (7b) (see p. 16).

Similarly, (8a) **Women kaishi wu dian* is a word order error because this sentence also violates principle no. 3, PTS, more specifically sub-principle 3.3 *Time Expressions*, yet more specifically Time Expressions sub-principle type 1: *Time* + *V* (3.3.1). This sub-principle type requires that a time expression precede a V when the time expression represents an earlier temporal state than the action denoted by the verb. The time expression *wu dian* '5 o'clock' in the above sentence represents an earlier temporal state than the verb *kaishi* 'begin', so *wu dian* should precede *kaishi*. Therefore, the correct form should be *Women wu dian kaishi*, as shown in (8b) (see p. 16).

Both word order errors (7a) and (8a) discussed above belong to the conceptual domain of the new taxonomy. In the following, error no. 72 (see appendix, p. 231) from the grammatical domain and error no. 402 (see appendix, p. 231) from the functional domain are explained using the new taxonomy. They are cited as examples (97) and (98).

(97a) *电影　明天　晚上　的 是 六 点　半　的。
Dianying mingtian wanshang de shi liu dian ban de.
Film tomorrow evening *de* is 6.30 pm
The film tomorrow evening is at 6.30 pm.

(97b) 明天　晚上　的 电影　是 六 点　半　的。
Mingtian wanshang de dianying shi liu dian ban de.
Tomorrow evening *de* film is 6:30 pm
The film tomorrow evening is at 6:30 pm.

(97a) is a word order error in Chinese because it violates principle no. 2, MBH, more specifically sub-principle 2.2 *Modifier* + *N* in the grammatical domain. This sub-principle requires that the modifier *mingtian wanshang de* 'tomorrow evening' precede the noun *dianying* 'the film', as shown in (97b).

(98a) *比较 安全　把 钱　放　在 银行。
Bijiao anquan ba qian fang zai yinhang.
Comparatively safe BA money put in bank
It is comparatively safe to put money in the bank.

(98b) 把 钱　放　在 银行　比较 安全。
Ba qian fang zai yinhang bijiao anquan.
BA money put in bank comparatively safe
It is comparatively safe to put money in the bank.

(98a) is erroneous in Chinese because it violates principle no. 6, PCD, in the functional domain. This principle requires that the sentence element carrying the highest CD be positioned at the end of a sentence. In (98a), *bijiao anquan* 'comparatively safe' carries the highest CD and should be positioned at the end of the sentence, as shown in (98b).

Thus, these principles, sub-principles and sub-principle types in the new taxonomy explain not only the erroneousness of the structure of (7a), (8a), (97a) and (98a) but also how to correct them from both the teacher and learner perspectives, if they are aware of these principles. For the purpose of instruction, the directness and explicitness in explaining word order errors achieved by employing the principle-based taxonomy cannot be achieved by utilizing any of the four sources discussed earlier (see p. 129).

5. Conclusion

This chapter firstly reviewed the six research questions (raised in Chapter One) that drive this study. It found that three of them have been answered by reviewing the literature in Chapter Two and Three.

The second section applied Ko's taxonomy to the data of this study showing 243 (60%) word order errors classified in the miscellaneous category. It demonstrated the narrow range of word order error types in her taxonomy because her three-category taxonomy accounts for only a portion of the word order errors produced by the participants in this study. In so doing, it answered research question no. 4 *How adequately do existing Chinese L2 word order error taxonomies account for the data collected in this study?* Ko's (1997) taxonomy is limited for describing word order errors made by the Chinese L2 learners in this study.

The third section firstly reported the inter-rater reliabilities for both word order error identification and word order error categorization. It then presented the results of a new categorization, namely categorizing word order errors in terms of the violation of a relevant word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type. A new taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors was developed by discussing the existing categories; by introducing, explaining and demonstrating new categories emerging from the data; and by explaining the four word order errors that were excluded. The newly developed principle-based taxonomy includes categories of four domains, seven principles, fourteen sub-principles and eleven sub-principle types.

In order to enhance understanding of this new taxonomy, the fourth section has identified six characteristics of the new taxonomy:

(1) It is not superficial since it has a theoretical base, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach;
(2) Compared with Ko's taxonomy, it covers a larger range of Chinese L2 word order errors;
(3) It is systematic because the existing categories and new categories emerging from the data are incorporated into one system by using a sole criterion, that is, the violation of any basic word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type;
(4) It is a taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors as well as a taxonomy of the core operating system that governs Chinese word order;
(5) The relationship between all the word order error categories is clearly shown through the taxonomy; and
(6) It is an open-ended rather than a closed system because new categories can be easily added as necessary.

The significance of having such a taxonomy available lies in the fact that more explicit description and clearer explanation of Chinese L2 word order errors for instruction purposes can be achieved.

Five of the six research questions have been answered so far. Chapter Seven answers the final research question, namely *what are the relative frequencies of occurrence of various Chinese word order errors in this study?* It is of interest to know the relative frequency of occurrence of the various error types, both overall and by proficiency levels. This will inform us as to which word order errors are likely to occur more frequently than others and hence cause more problems in learning. In order to do so, the following chapter presents and discusses the numbers and rates of word order errors in all the categories of the new taxonomy.

Chapter Seven: Chinese word order errors: frequency of occurrence

The previous chapter presented a new taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. In this chapter the relative frequencies of occurrence of the different error types will be reported, both overall and by the three proficiency levels. This will provide insight into the relative difficulty of the error types and how error types might vary by proficiency level. In order to have a better understanding of error distributions among the various categories in the new taxonomy, error rates in each of the categories, both overall and by proficiency levels, are also provided. In so doing, a quantitative perspective of Chinese L2 word order errors is provided.

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section presents how the word order error rates were calculated. The second section presents and discusses the error rates for all word order error categories in the principle-based taxonomy.

1. Calculation method of word order error rates

The word order error rates were calculated by dividing the number of errors by the total number of characters that the errors were extracted from. The error rates for the three different proficiency levels were calculated respectively. Then the error rates were multiplied by 1000, resulting in the number of word order errors per 1000 characters. The distribution of the categorized 404 word order errors in the principle-based taxonomy is presented. Details are shown in Table 7.1. As noted under the table, the number outside the brackets is the error rate, that is, number of errors per 1000 characters, while the number inside the brackets is the actual number of errors occurring in each category. For example, in the 1.1 Question sub-principle category, two word order errors occurred and the error rate is 0.33 for level 1 learners. This also applies to Tables 7.2–7.6.

2. Error rates for all word order error categories in the new taxonomy

This section firstly presents and discusses the overall word order error rates across the three proficiency levels. It then presents and discusses the error rate and number for each word order error category in the principle-based taxonomy, according to the four layers of the taxonomy, namely domain, principle, sub-principle and sub-principle type.

2.1. Overall word order error rates

Table 7.1 shows the four-layered taxonomy of word order error categories and the rate and number of errors for each of the categories. Taking all categories together, the word order error rate is 9.58 for level 1; 9.69 for level 2; and 13.77 for level 3. Instead of decreasing as expected, the word order error rate increases slightly from level 1 to level 2, and greatly from level 2 to level 3. The high word order error rate of level 3 learners does not necessarily indicate a low proficiency level of their word order acquisition because many factors can affect learners' word order error rates. These factors include proficiency levels, different genres and topics, constraints of writing tasks (for example, writing under examination conditions or not), complexity of structures used and whether learners employ avoidance strategy in their writing. Nevertheless, the increasing word order error rates from level 1 to level 2 to level 3 confirm one point, all learners in this study including level 3 learners, the learners with the highest proficiency level, had problems with their Chinese L2 word order acquisition.

The overall word order error rates show a general increasing trend from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. The low error rate of level 1 learners does not necessarily mean their word order proficiency is high. One explanation can be: The writing tasks for level 1 learners allowed them to use the language items learned in their textbook. They might have produced a large portion of their sentences as "chunk-based" items. In other words, a great portion of sentences from level 1 learners' written samples were likely rote produced instead of being composed on their own, since they had not yet reached the stage where they could use their target language creatively. This claim finds support in Pienemann's (1998) Processability Theory (PT), as discussed in Chapter Two (section 2.2, p. 32). According to PT, at the beginning stage of L2 development, only invariant forms such as individual words, phrases, formulaic ex-

Table 7.1 A four-layered taxonomy of word order error categories and error rates

Domain	Principle	Sub-principle	Sub-principle type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Overall
Grammatical	1. GPP	1.1 Question 1.2 Topic-comment		0.33 (2)* 0.5 (3)	0.05 (1) 0.28 (6)	0.28 (3) 0.57 (6)	0.16 (6) 0.40 (15)
	2. MBH	2.1 Modifier + N 2.2 *De* Position		0.33 (2) 0.66 (4)	0.52 (11) 0.28 (6)	1.04 (11) 0.38 (4)	0.64 (24) 0.37 (14)
Conceptual	3. PTS	3.1 Action Series	3.1.1 Natural Iconicity 3.1.2 Conceptual Iconicity 3.1.3 Direction + Action 3.1.4 *Le* Position	0.33 (2) 0.17 (1) 0.33 (2) 0.17 (1)	0.33 (7) 0.57 (12) 0.38 (8) 0.24 (5)	0.1 (1) 0.76 (8) 0.66 (7) 0.1 (1)	0.26 (10) 0.56 (21) 0.45 (17) 0.19 (7)
		3.2 Locative Expressions	3.2.1 Location + V 3.2.2 V + Location	0.5 (3) 0.17 (1)	0.85 (18) 0.28 (6)	0.47 (5) 0	0.69 (26) 0.19 (7)
		3.3 Time Expressions	3.3.1 Time + V 3.3.2 V + Time 3.3.3 Duration + *Mei(you)* + V	0.99 (6) 1.32 (8) 0	1.09 (23) 0.71 (15) 0.1 (2)	0.47 (5) 0.38 (4) 0.47 (5)	0.9 (34) 0.72 (27) 0.19 (7)
		3.4 Beneficiary		1.16 (7)	0.14 (3)	0.57 (6)	0.42 (16)
		3.5 Modifiers of V.	3.5.1 Adv. + V 3.5.2 V + Adv.	0.99 (6) 0	1.32 (28) 0.14 (3)	1.61 (17) 0.76 (8)	1.35 (51) 0.29 (11)
		3.6 Subsidiary Relations		0	0.14 (3)	1.14 (12)	0.40 (15)
	4. WBP	4.1 Temporal Scope		0.33 (2)	0.14 (3)	1.04 (11)	0.42 (16)
		4.2 Spatial Scope		0.17 (1)	0.8 (17)	1.23 (13)	0.82 (31)
		4.3 Time + Space + Manner + V.		0	0.33 (7)	0.47 (5)	0.32 (12)
		4.4 General + Particular		0.17 (1)	0.38 (8)	0.19 (2)	0.29 (11)
Functional	5. PCD			0.17 (1)	0.24 (5)	0.95 (10)	0.42 (16)
	6. PF			0	0.14 (3)	0.09 (1)	0.11 (4)
Sociocultural	7. EP			0.50 (3)	0.14 (3)	0	0.16 (6)
Other				0.33 (2)	0.1 (2)	0	0.11 (4)
Total				58	205	145	408
Sum of characters				6056	21164	10529	37749
Per1000 characters				9.58	9.69	13.77	10.81

* The number outside the brackets is the error rate, specifically the number of errors per 1000 characters, while the number inside the brackets is the actual number of errors occurring in each category. For example, under the 1.1 Question sub-principle category, two word order errors occurred and the error rate is 0.33 for level 1 learners.

pressions and 'chunked-learned' items are produced because they directly map the underlying meaning and do not involve any grammatical information exchange between constituents. Ellis (1984, 2005), Myles, Hooper and Mitchell (1998) and Myles, Mitchell and Hooper (1999) also argue that L2 learners' first stage learning is chunked-based. In Ellis' (2005) words: "Classroom studies … demonstrate that learners often internalize rote-learned material as *chunks* [italics added], breaking them down for analysis later on" (p. 211).

The word order error rate of level 2 learners is slightly higher than that of level 1 learners although level 2 learners had higher proficiency. It appears that level 2 learners composed their L2 writing tasks more creatively than level 1 learners, thus creating more chances for word order errors to occur.

However, instead of decreasing as expected, the word order error rate increased greatly from level 2 to level 3. This could be due to (1) level 2 learners creatively produced more short and syntactically less complex sentences than level 3 learners, which made word order arrangement less challenging; and (2) level 2 learners employed avoidance strategy more frequently than level 3 learners. In other words, level 3 learners creatively produced more complicated sentences and less frequently employed avoidance strategy, hence creating more chances for word order errors to occur.

2.2. Word order error rates according to domain categories

Table 7.2 presents the word order error rates for the four domains. The word order error rates from the highest to the lowest are as follows:

Conceptual (8.45) > Grammatical (1.56) > Functional (0.53) > Sociocultural (0.16)

Table 7.2 Word order error rates according to domain categories

Domain	**Level 1**	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Overall**
Grammatical	1.82 (11)	1.13 (24)	2.28 (24)	1.56 (59)*
Conceptual	6.77 (41)	7.80 (168)	10.45 (110)	8.45 (319)
Functional	0.17 (1)	0.38 (8)	1.04 (11)	0.53 (20)
Sociocultural	0.50 (3)	0.14 (3)	0	0.16 (6)
Total	9.25 (56)	9.54 (202)	13.77 (145)	10.68 (404)

*The number outside the brackets is the error rate, that is, number of errors per 1000 characters, while the number inside the brackets is the actual number of errors occurring in each category. For example, 59 word order errors occurred in the grammatical domain category resulting in 1.56 errors per 1000 characters overall for the three proficiency levels.

Conceptual domain: As shown above, this domain has a much higher error rate than the remaining three domains. Specifically, 79% (319/404) fall within this domain. One explanation could be that the L2 learners' conceptualization of the world was still largely based on their L1. This result supports the theoretical framework adopted in the present study, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach (see pp. 57–69). It appears that Chinese word order errors occurred when the learners mapped their L1-based conceptualization onto their L2 structures. Moreover, the word order error rates for this domain present an increasing pattern from level 1 (6.77) to level 2 (7.80) to level 3 (10.45). The explanation for overall word order error rates above in section 2.1 applies to the trend in this domain. From largely chunk-based learning at level 1 to more creatively composing their writing at level 2 and to employing more complicated sentence structures in their writing at level 3, a lack of mastery of the Chinese conceptualizations of the world by learners even at level 3, sees each higher proficiency level allow more opportunities to make word order errors.

Nevertheless, accepting that level 1 learners' learning was largely chunk-based, their word order error rate of 6.77 in the conceptual domain remains comparatively high. It seems most likely, therefore, that level 1 learners' learning was chunk-based only for the first semester, with learners starting to creatively compose in the second semester and so produce notable numbers of word order errors for level 1 as a whole.

Grammatical domain: The word order error rate for this domain is the second highest among the four domains, being 1.82 at level 1 dropping to 1.13 at level 2 and increasing to 2.28 at level 3. This suggests that level 1 learners had some difficulty in arranging word orders correctly in this domain for the structures they either could not remember well or composed creatively. When reaching level 2, learners' difficulty in arranging word orders correctly appears reduced due to more exposure and practice in their L2. When reaching level 3, learners' difficulty in arranging word orders correctly increased again due to more complex grammatical structures being incorporated into their language use.

Functional domain: The word order error rate for this domain, while being quite low, presents an increasing pattern from level 1 to level 2 to level 3, as with the conceptual domain. This suggests that at each higher proficiency level more structures involving functional principles were produced with more chances being created for making errors.

Sociocultural domain: The word order error rate in this domain is not only the lowest overall but also presents a decreasing pattern from level 1 (0.50) to level 2 (0.14) to level 3 (0). No word order errors are found at

level 3. This suggests that word order sequences in this domain may be easy to acquire. This is likely because this domain covers a narrower range of structures and the word order arrangements in this domain are not as complicated as those in the other three domains.

2.3. Word order error rates according to principle categories

Word order errors did not distribute evenly among the seven principle categories. Table 7.3 below presents the relative frequency of occurrence of the different types of word order errors for all these categories:

Table 7.3 Word order error rates according to principle categories

Principles	**Level 1**	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Overall**
1. GPP*	0.83 (5)	0.33 (7)	0.85 (9)	0.56 (21)*
2. MBH	0.99 (6)	0.80 (17)	1.42 (15)	1.01 (38)
3. PTS	6.11 (37)	6.28 (133)	7.50 (79)	6.60 (249)
4. WBP	0.66 (4)	1.65 (35)	2.94 (31)	1.85 (70)
5. PCD	0.17 (1)	0.24 (5)	0.95 (10)	0.42 (16)
6. PF	0	0.14 (3)	0.09 (1)	0.11 (4)
7. EP	0.50 (3)	0.14 (3)	0	0.13 (5)

*1. GPP: The Greenberg Pattern Principle; MBH: The Principle of Modifier Before Head; PTS: The Principle of Temporal Sequence; WBP: The Principle of Whole Before Part; PCD: The Principle of Communicative Dynamism; PF: The Principle of Focus; EP: The Empathetic Principle.

*2. The number outside the brackets is the error rate, that is, number of errors per 1000 characters, while the number inside the brackets is the actual number of errors occurring in each category. For example, 21 word order errors occurred in the GPP category resulting in 0.56 errors per 1000 characters overall for the three proficiency levels.

As shown in Table 7.3, the word order error rates of these categories from the highest to the lowest are as follows:

PTS (6.60) > WBP (1.85) > MBH (1.01) > GPP (0.56) > PCD (0.42) > EP (0.13)> PF (0.11)

Word order error rates for each of the categories are discussed below, according to the domain to which they belong.

Conceptual domain (PTS and WBP): In this domain, it appears that word order errors occurred when learners mapped their L1-based con-

ceptualization of the world onto their L2 structures, as discussed earlier. Altogether 249 (62%) word order errors occurred due to the violation of PTS and 70 (17.3%) word order errors occurred due to the violation of WBP. The word order error rates in the two principle categories not only rank the highest and the second highest respectively, but also present an increasing pattern from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. This suggests that the learners in this study had great difficulty in observing PTS and WBP.

Grammatical domain (MBH and GPP): The word order error rates for MBH and GPP, which fall within the grammatical domain, rank the third and fourth highest overall respectively. Their error rates follow the same pattern across the three proficiency levels: high at level 1, lower at level 2 and high again at level 3. As explained earlier, it appears that level 1 learners had some difficulty in arranging word orders correctly in these two grammatical principle categories for the structures they either could not remember well or composed creatively. When reaching level 2, learners' difficulty in arranging word orders correctly appears reduced due to more exposure and practice in their L2. When reaching level 3, learners' difficulty in arranging word orders correctly increased again due to more complex grammatical structures being incorporated into their language use. The 'advanced' learners in this study still had problems in observing these two grammatical principles (MBH and GPP).

Functional domain (PCD and PF): For the two functional principles, the error rates are comparatively lower than the principle categories in the conceptual and grammatical domains. However, this does not necessarily indicate that PCD and PF are easy to acquire. Given that PCD and PF govern rhetorical and strategic use of word order in Chinese, usually only advanced learners are competent enough to make use of them. In other words, usually a learner cannot make word order errors due to the violation of PCD or PF until s/he attains an advanced proficiency level in Chinese. That is why few errors due to the violation of PCD or PF are found either in level 1 or level 2 data. Moreover, this is particularly the case with PF whose word order error rate remains very low even at level 3. In the PCD category, the higher error rate (0.95) of level 3 indicates that learners of this proficiency level used more structures involving the PCD principle and thus created more chances for making such errors.

Sociocultural domain (EP): Only one principle (EP) falls within this domain. No word order error is found for this principle category at

level 3. Given the steady downward trend of word order error rate for the EP category and especially the non-appearance of word order errors at level 3, it appears that EP had been acquired by level 3 learners. This also suggests that EP, unlike other word order principles, can be acquired without explicit instruction.

2.4. Word order error rates according to sub-principle categories

Table 7.4 presents the word order error rates for all the sub-principle categories at each of the three proficiency levels. The word order error rates for these sub-principle categories are discussed according to the principle to which they belong.

Table 7.4 Word order error rates according to sub-principle categories

Principle	Sub-principle	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Overall
1. GPP	1.1 Question	0.33 (2)	0.05 (1)	0.28 (3)	0.16 (6)*
	1.2 Topic-comment	0.5 (3)	0.28 (6)	0.57 (6)	0.40 (15)
2. MBH	2.1 Modifier + N	0.33 (2)	0.52 (11)	1.04 (11)	0.64 (24)
	2.2 *De* Position	0.66 (4)	0.28 (6)	0.38 (4)	0.37 (14)
3. PTS	3.1 Action Series	0.99 (6)	1.51 (32)	1.61 (17)	1.46 (55)
	3.2 Locative Expressions	0.66 (4)	1.13 (24)	0.47 (5)	0.87 (33)
	3.3 Time Expressions	2.31 (14)	1.89 (40)	1.33 (14)	1.80 (68)
	3.4 Beneficiary	1.16 (7)	0.14 (3)	0.57 (6)	0.42 (16)
	3.5 Modifiers of V	0.99 (6)	1.46 (31)	2.37 (25)	1.64 (62)
	3.6 Subsidiary Relations	0	0.14 (3)	1.14 (12)	0.40 (15)
4. WBP	4.1 Temporal Scope	0.33 (2)	0.14 (3)	1.04 (11)	0.42 (16)
	4.2 Spatial Scope	0.17 (1)	0.8 (17)	1.23 (13)	0.82 (31)
	4.3 Time + Place + Manner + V	0	0.33 (7)	0.47 (5)	0.32 (12)
	4.4 General + Particular	0.17 (1)	0.38 (8)	0.19 (2)	0.29 (11)

*The number outside the brackets is the error rate, that is, number of errors per 1000 characters, while the number inside the brackets is the actual number of errors occurring in each category. For example, 6 word order errors occurred in the 1.1 Question sub-principle category resulting in 0.16 errors per 1000 characters overall for the three proficiency levels.

The Greenberg Pattern Principle (GPP): Under this principle, the error rate is higher for the *Topic-comment* sub-principle category than for the *Question* sub-principle category, both overall and at each of the three proficiency levels. It is unlikely that learners avoided using *Question* because it is a fundamental linguistic element and thus rarely avoidable. So, it appears that the *Topic-comment* sub-principle is more problematic to learners than the *Question* sub-principle. More emphasis should to be given to *Topic-comment* sub-principle in teaching the two sub-principles. Note that word order error rates in both the *Question* and *Topic-comment* categories decreased at level 2 and increased again at level 3. This follows the grammatical principle patterns as explained earlier (p. 189).

The Principle of Modifier Before Head (MBH): Under this principle, the highest error rate for the *Modifier* + *N* sub-principle category is found at level 3 whilst the highest error rate for *De Position* sub-principle category is found at level 1. This suggests that the *De Position* sub-principle was more problematic for level 1 learners while the *Modifier* + *N* sub-principle was more problematic for level 3 learners. It is likely that learners became more confident in observing *De Position* sub-principle with increased proficiency levels. In contrast, the error rate for the *Modifier* + *N* category, unlike the other grammatical sub-principle category, presents a consistently increasing pattern from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. This is likely due to learners' producing more complicated modifiers, such as attributive clauses, at each higher proficiency level, hence creating more chances for errors to occur.

The Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS): As discussed earlier, PTS seems difficult to acquire. Among the six sub-principle categories, *Time Expressions*, *Modifier of V* and *Action Series* appear to be more difficult to acquire than the remaining three categories, according to the error rates presented in Table 7.4. Of the three sub-principle categories whose error rates are significantly higher, a decreasing pattern of word order errors from level 1 to level 2 to level 3 only occurs in the *Time Expressions* category. This suggests that the *Time Expressions* sub-principle can be acquired earlier than the other two sub-principles, given the decreasing error trend.

The word order error rates present an increasing pattern from level 1 to level 2 to level 3 in the *Modifier of V, Action Series* and *Subsidiary Relations* categories. This is not surprising given that structures in these three categories are syntactically more complex than a simple SVO

structure. Specifically, a structure in the *Modifier of V* category has at least one adverb to modify the verb while a simple SVO structure does not have any. A structure in the *Action Series* category usually includes at least two verbs while a simple SVO structure includes only one. A structure in the *Subsidiary Relations* category includes at least two clauses while a simple SVO structure includes only one. As learners produced longer and more complex sentences as they attained higher proficiency levels, more chances for making word order errors in these three categories were created. This is particularly illustrated in the *Subsidiary Relations* category, where no errors occurred at level 1 because learners were not yet capable of using complex sentences. The error rate increasing from level 2 to level 3 indicates that level 3 learners used more complex sentences.

As to the *Locative Expressions* and *Beneficiary* categories, the former seemed most problematic at level 2 while the latter seemed most problematic at level 1, according to their word order error rates. Level 3 learners still had a moderate degree of difficulty in correctly arranging word orders in these two categories.

The Principle of Whole Before Part (WBP): Among the four subprinciple categories under this principle, *Temporal Scope* and *Spatial Scope* categories seemed more difficult for learners to acquire since their error rates are significantly higher than those of the other two categories, especially at level 3. This might suggest that, in particular, the learners' conceptualization of time and space in terms of the WBP principle is still largely based on their L1 (English). The most basic concepts of the world, such as time and space, seem most entrenched in learners' L1 conceptualizations. Emphasis should be given constantly to these categories in teaching Chinese word order.

The word order error rate in the *Time* + *Place* + *Manner* + *V* category presents an increasing trend from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. This pattern is similar to that in the *Subsidiary Relations* category discussed earlier under PTS principle. No errors occurred at level 1 because learners were not yet capable of using complex sentences incorporating up to three modifiers of a verb. The error rate increasing from level 2 to level 3 indicates that level 3 learners used more complex sentences, thus creating more chances for making errors.

As for the *General* + *Particular* category, the word order error rate did not vary much across the three proficiency levels, apart from a slight increase at level 2. This might indicate that learners' increased proficiency and the increased complexity of structures used together produced a com-

bined effect on the word order error rates, thus not showing any clear increasing or decreasing pattern across the three proficiency levels.

2.5. Word order error rates according to sub-principle type categories

Table 7.5 presents the word order error rates for all the sub-principle type categories across the three proficiency levels. The word order error rates of these sub-principle type categories are discussed below according to the sub-principles to which they belong.

Table 7.5 Word order error rates according to sub-principle type categories

Sub-principle	Sub-principle type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Overall
Action Series	3.1.1 Natural Iconicity	0.33 (2)*	0.33 (7)	0.1 (1)	0.26 (10)
	3.1.2 Conceptual Iconicity	0.17 (1)	0.57 (12)	0.76 (8)	0.56 (21)
	3.1.3 Direction + Action	0.33 (2)	0.38 (2)	0.66 (7)	0.45 (17)
	3.1.4 *Le* Position	0.17 (1)	0.24 (5)	0.1 (1)	0.19 (1)
Locative Expressions	3.2.1 Location + V	0.5 (3)	0.85 (18)	0.47 (5)	0.69 (26)
	3.2.2 V + Location	0.17 (1)	0.24 (5)	0	0.19 (7)
Time Expressions	3.3.1 Time + V	0.99 (6)	1.09 (23)	0.47 (5)	0.9 (34)
	3.3.2 V + Time	1.32 (8)	0.17 (15)	0.38 (4)	0.72 (27)
	3.3.3 Duration + *Mei(you)* + V	0	0.1 (2)	0.47 (5)	0.19 (7)
Modifiers of V	3.5.1 Adv. + V	0.99 (6)	1.32 (28)	1.61 (17)	1.35 (51)
	3.5.2 V + Adv.	0	0.14 (3)	0.76 (8)	0.29 (11)

*The number outside the brackets is the error rate, that is, number of errors per 1000 characters, while the number inside the brackets is the actual number of errors occurring in each category. For example, two word order errors occurred in the Natural Iconicity category resulting in 0.33 errors per 1000 characters for level 1 learners.

Action Series: Among the four sub-principle types under this sub-principle, *Conceptual Iconicity* and *Direction + Action* appear more difficult to acquire than *Natural Iconicity* and *Le Position*, because the error rates in the first two categories are not only much higher at level 3 but also present an increasing trend from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. For both *Natural Iconicity* and *Le Position* categories, only 1 error oc-

curred at level 3. This suggests that most learners have acquired these two sub-principle types by level 3.

Locative Expressions: Under this sub-principle, more errors occurred in the *Location* + *V* category than the *V* + *Location* category, both overall (0.69 versus 0.19) and at each of the three proficiency levels. In particular, no error is found at level 3 for the latter. This indicates that the former is more difficult to acquire than the latter. This could be due to the difference of the *Location* + *V* category and the similarity of the *V* + *Location* category in arranging word orders in Chinese and English.

Time Expressions: Learners seemed to have various difficulties at different proficiency levels in acquiring the three sub-principle types. According to their word order error rates, it appears that *Time* + *V* was more problematic at level 1 and level 2; *V* + *Time* was most problematic at level 1; while *Duration* + *Mei (you)* + *V* was most problematic at level 3. Particularly, the word order error rates of the *Duration* + *Mei (you)* + *V* category, although not very high, increased steadily from level 1 to level 2 to level 3, most likely due to the syntactic complexity of the structure. No errors occurred at level 1 because learners at this proficiency level were not competent enough to use this structure.

Modifiers of V: Under this sub-principle, more errors occurred in the *Adv.* + *V* category than the *V* + *Adv.* category, although both remained high at level 3. This suggests that (1) *Adv.* + *V* could have a wider application range than *V* + *Adv.*; or (2) learners could have avoided using *V* + *Adv.* structures because they are more difficult. The error rates in both categories present an increasing pattern from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. This suggests that these structures are difficult for English learners of Chinese to acquire.

Hitherto the error rates in all the taxonomic categories have been discussed. The final research question, namely '*what are the relative frequencies of occurrence of various Chinese word order errors in this study?*', has been answered. As mentioned earlier (p. 186), the overall increasing word order error rates from level 1 to level 2 to level 3 indicate that learners had problems with their word order acquisition across the three proficiency levels. However, the increasing trend does not necessarily mean that learners' mastery of Chinese word order was from bad to worse. Instead, each higher proficiency level enabled learners to use the target language more creatively and to write with more complicated structures and, hence, more chances for making word order errors were created. This explains the overall increasing word order error rates.

3. Conclusion

This chapter has presented the results obtained through a quantitative analysis of the word order errors extracted from the written samples collected. The first section has reported the calculation method of the word order error rates in this study. The word order error rates are represented by numbers of word order errors per 1000 characters. The second section has presented and discussed word order error rates in all the taxonomic categories. Explanations have been provided for the overall increasing trend of word order errors from level 1 to level 2 to level 3.

The comparatively low word order error rate at level 1 is likely due to learners' chunk-based learning stage, when a large number of sentences are rote produced from learners' memory instead of being creatively composed. The higher word order error rate of level 2 likely resulted from learners' increased ability to write more creatively, creating more chances for making word order errors. The highest word order error rate is found at level 3. This is most likely due to level 3 learners' increased ability to use longer and more complex structures in their writing, creating even more chances for making errors.

According to the word order error rates in the four domain categories, the conceptual and functional domains seem to be more problematic than the remaining two domains across all three proficiency levels. The grammatical domain appears more problematic at level 3 when learners used more complicated structures in their writing. The sociocultural domain appears to be the least problematic for learners.

The frequencies of occurrence of word order errors in the seven principle categories indicate that PTS and WBP were the most problematic across all three proficiency levels. GPP, MBH, PCD and PF became more problematic at level 3 when learners were more competent and used more complex structures in their writing. EP was the least problematic since it was likely acquired by the level 3 learners in the present study.

Based on the error rates of the 14 sub-principle categories, *Topic-comment* appears to need more attention in the classroom than *Question. Modifier + N* deserves more attention than *De Position*, especially at level 3. *Action Series*, *Modifiers of V* and *Subsidiary Relations* are more problematic than the remaining three sub-principles under PTS, especially at level 3. Finally, *Temporal Scope* and *Spatial Scope* appear to require more attention than the remaining two sub-principles under WBP, in order to overcome learners' L1-based conceptualizations in using L2.

The frequencies of occurrence of word order errors in the 11 sub-principle type categories indicate that *Conceptual Iconicity* and *Direction + Action* were more problematic than the remaining two types under the Action Series sub-principle category, especially at level 3. Under the Locative Expressions sub-principle category, *Location + V* was more problematic than *V + Location*, most likely due to an L1 negative transfer in the former and an L1 positive transfer in the latter. Under the Time Expressions sub-principle category, *Time + V* was more problematic at both level 1 and level 2; *V + Time* was most problematic at level 1 while *Duration + Mei (you) + V* was most problematic at level 3. Under the Modifiers of V sub-principle category, both *Adv. + V* and *V + Adv.* were most problematic at level 3.

The results support the theoretical framework adopted to guide this research project, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach. In terms of word order, learners' conceptualizations of the world, even at level 3, appeared to still largely be based on their L1. The most basic concepts such as time and space are seemingly most entrenched in learners' L1 conceptualizations. Thus, these areas may require more attention in the classroom. The findings of the data analysis in this study are pedagogically meaningful. The attendant pedagogical implications of the findings, along with other concluding remarks, are presented in the final chapter of the book.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

The previous two chapters reported the results of data analysis of this research project. Chapter Six provides a qualitative perspective of Chinese L2 word order errors by identifying the categories of the new principle-based taxonomy. Chapter Seven provides a quantitative perspective of Chinese L2 word order errors by presenting the relative frequencies of occurrence of these errors. This chapter is the concluding chapter of this book. It consists of five sections: the first section briefly revisits the research objectives; the second section summarizes the main findings and states the contributions of this project; the third section discusses the limitations; the fourth section provides pedagogical implications based on the findings of this study; and the final section concludes with some suggested topics for further research.

1. A brief review of research objectives

The main objectives of this study were (1) to critically evaluate the existing word order error taxonomies; and (2) to develop a comprehensive taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors in order to enable explicit description and clear explanation of them.

The first objective has been achieved by answering the first three research questions through the literature review in Chapters Two and Three. The second objective has been achieved by answering the remaining three research questions in Chapters Six and Seven.

Developing a taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors is one preliminary and crucial step towards a better understanding of the difficulties in learning Chinese L2 word order. Such a taxonomy enables a more explicit description and clearer explanation of Chinese word order errors in a pedagogical sense, which is a necessary prerequisite for effective error-correction feedback. The author believes that such a taxonomy has great potential for helping learners deal with word order errors more efficiently and effectively.

2. Summary of the findings and contributions

The principal achievement of this project is the establishment of a principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. This taxonomy includes categories of four domains, seven principles, fourteen sub-principles and eleven sub-principle types (see Table 6.3, p. 176). It was developed by categorizing Chinese word order errors through using one sole criterion, that is, the violation of any basic word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type. Therefore, it is actually a taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors as well as a taxonomy of the core operating system governing Chinese word order and its variations. Thus, the significance of this taxonomy is twofold: (1) it provides support for the core operating systemic account of Chinese word order and its variations; and (2) it describes and explains Chinese L2 word order errors in a systematic manner.

2.1. Main findings

The main findings obtained in the development of the principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors include:

(1) Four hundred and four (99%) out of a total of 408 word order errors were successfully categorized by using the criterion of violation of any basic word order principle, sub-principle or sub-principle type.
(2) The categories of Chinese word order errors identified in the literature are far from complete. Many new categories emerged with the new categorization through analyzing the data.
(3) The word order principles and sub-principles governing Chinese word order obtained from the literature are also incomplete. A new domain (the sociocultural domain), a new principle (the Greenberg Pattern Principle), seven sub-principles and eleven sub-principle types have been nominated, described and demonstrated with examples.
(4) Among the seven principle categories in the principle-based taxonomy, the Principle of Temporal Sequence (PTS) has been found to have the widest application range in explaining Chinese L2 word order errors, since 249 (62%) out of a total of 404 categorized word order errors violate PTS.
(5) The newly developed principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors (see Table 6.3, p. 176) includes four layers of categories: four domains, seven principles, 14 sub-principles and

11 sub-principle types. These categories are organized by incorporating more specific categories into more general categories. The relationship between all the word order error categories is clearly shown through the taxonomy.

2.2. Main contributions

The principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors developed in this study is built on and extended from the categories of an existing taxonomy in the literature. All the new categories emerging from the data and the existing categories from the literature are successfully incorporated into one system. This taxonomy has overcome the limitations of other taxonomies available in the literature in four important aspects.

Firstly, the principle-based taxonomy is not superficial since it has a theoretical base, namely the Cognitive Functionalist Approach. According to this approach, adult L2 learners' conceptualization of the world is based on their L1 initially. Their conceptualizations of the world impose constraints on their L2 linguistic structures. Errors can occur when English learners of Chinese impose their conceptualization based on the English language onto the Chinese language structures. In addition to the L2 (Chinese) forms, what the learners also need to acquire is the conceptualization system of the world based on L2 (Chinese). In terms of Chinese word order, the word order principles (sub-principles and sub-principle types) are the instantiations of the conceptualization of the world based on Chinese. Violation of any of these word order principles (or sub-principles or sub-principle types) inevitably leads to a word order error.

Secondly, the principle-based taxonomy is systematic and empirically testable. All the new categories emerging from the data and the existing categories from the literature are successfully incorporated into one system.

Thirdly, this taxonomy provides a sense of order between the categories because more specific categories are incorporated into more general categories. Moreover, the relationship between all the word order error categories is clearly shown through the taxonomy.

Finally, it is an open-ended rather than a closed system. New categories can be added as necessary.

In summary, the taxonomy provides a principle-based description and explanation of various Chinese L2 word order errors. A word order

error is an error because it violates a relevant word order principle (or sub-principle). The principle not only explains why an error is an error but also provides the way of correcting the error. In a pedagogical sense, the directness and explicitness in explaining word order errors achieved by employing this taxonomy cannot be achieved by relying on any other sources of errors available in the literature.

3. Limitations

Identifying limitations of a piece of research is necessary since care needs to be taken not to generalize the findings beyond its limitations. It needs to be noted that the existence of limitations does not invalidate any of the findings.

3.1. Limitations of EA in SLA research

As noted above, the newly developed Chinese L2 word order error taxonomy is a significant contribution to Chinese SLA research. Word order errors provide one perspective of Chinese L2 word order acquisition: they indicate the difficulties in learning Chinese word order. However, word order error frequencies on their own are not sufficient to indicate word order acquisition development, because, when the word order error rate for each category was calculated, the proportion of correct forms in that category was not considered.

3.2. Limitations of sampling

The sample of learner participants in this study comprised 116 native-English-speaking learners of Chinese: 33 from level 1, 53 from level 2 and 30 from level 3, based on institutional status. As mentioned earlier, the word order error rates present an increasing pattern from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. Based on this result, it seems that the Chinese word order proficiency of level 3 learners was still far from the native level because the highest word order error rate was found at level 3. A decrease in word order error rate would have been expected if a more

advanced learner group had been included. It appears that an ideal cross-sectional sample would include learners with low, intermediate, advanced and near-native proficiency levels.

The limitation of the sampling can also be revealed by the fact that no examples showing competition between word order principles have been found in the data. According to Hu (1995), Chinese word order principles can cooperate or compete with each other in governing Chinese word order arrangements. However, most of the examples collected show a cooperative relationship between the principles. Most likely it was because the learners' language sample did not involve many rhetorical and strategic usages of word order, due to their L2 proficiency limit. These usages can cause competition between principles. For example, PTS requires that a time expression follow a verb if it results from the verb or shows how long the action denoted by the verb lasts. However, example (99) in the following shows that such a time expression can appear before the verb in order to express a strong sense of contrast:

(99) 他 **一个 星期** 学 了 汉语，**两个 星期** 学 了 历史，
Ta yige xingqi xue le hanyu, liangge xingqi xue le lishi,
三个 星期 学 了 音乐。
sange xingqi xue le yinyue.
He one week study Chinese, two week study history, three week study music.
He spent one week studying Chinese, two weeks studying history and three weeks studying music.

The conceptual principle PTS requires the time expressions *yige xingqi* 'one week', *liangge xingqi* 'two weeks' and *sange xingqi* 'three weeks' follow the verb *xue* 'to study'. However, the functional principle PF requires that these time expressions precede the verb in order to express strong contrast by focusing more on the time expressions. In this case, PTS and PF are in competition. PF wins out eventually in this situation because the focus on contrast is stronger than the constraint of observing PTS. Due to the sampling limitation, examples like (99) were not found in the data collected. This is most likely because learners' language use did not reach a sufficiently high level of proficiency.

While acknowledging the sampling limitation, the four-layered principle-based taxonomy developed would be adequate for explaining word order arrangements that involve competition between principles.

4. Pedagogical implications of the findings

As one of the motivations for conducting this research is to improve the treatment of word order errors in the classroom, this section discusses the pedagogical implications of the findings in this study, in particular, the potential benefits of teaching Chinese word order principles to L2 learners.

Research shows that instruction can have a significant effect on L2 acquisition, at least in terms of the rate of learning and the long-term success that learners achieve in using the language accurately (Ellis, 1989; Pica, 1983; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Spada & Lightbown, 2002). In terms of Chinese word order acquisition, word order errors abound in learners' writing performance, as shown in the taxonomy developed. In this study, it is demonstrated that the major cause of the various word order errors are violations of relevant principles. Learners did not seem to be aware of the Chinese word order principles, as their introduction is not a feature of current Chinese language pedagogy. No Chinese textbooks, for example, introduce the basic Chinese word order principles, especially the conceptual and functional principles. In order to improve learners' word order performance, the results of this study indicate that it is imperative for the basic Chinese word order principles be included in a CFL curriculum.

As discussed in Chapter Seven, among the four domains of word order principles, the sociocultural domain appears to be the least problematic since the principle (EP) in this domain was likely acquired by the level 3 learners in the present study. This suggests that EP, unlike other word order principles, can be acquired without explicit instruction. The remaining three domains of word order principles are more problematic and need to be explicitly taught, judging by the increasing pattern of word order error rates from level 1 to level 2 to level 3. Based on the principle-based word order error taxonomy developed in this study and the relative frequencies of occurrence of specific word order errors, both overall and at different proficiency levels, a possible sequence for teaching word order principles can be proposed: (1) teaching the grammatical principles at elementary level, but after the chunk-based learning stage; (2) teaching the conceptual principles at intermediate level; and (3) teaching the functional principles at advanced level. This recommended sequence is motivated by the findings of this book. Explanations are provided below.

4.1. Teaching grammatical principles at elementary level

The grammatical principles of word order are the most basic principles. According to Hu (1995), grammatical principles function at the syntactic level. They prescribe what types of word order are grammatical in Chinese. As a reminder, the two principles in this domain are the *Greenberg Pattern Principle* (GPP) and the *Modifier-Before Head Principle* (MBH). These two principles should be taught as early as possible in order for learners to acquire the correct word order patterns in the target language.

The overall increasing pattern of the word order error rates from level 1 to level 2 to level 3 obtained in this study supports Ellis' (2005) claim that the first stage of L2 learning is largely chunk-based learning. Ellis (2005) further argues "If formulaic chunks play a large role in early language acquisition, it may pay to focus on these initially, delaying the teaching of grammar until later" (p. 211). If this is the case, it would be preferable to start teaching word order principles after the chunk-based learning stage. As discussed in Chapter Seven (p. 186), it is reasonable to believe that in this study the chunk-based learning stage was limited to the first semester of the first year instruction. Therefore, it is recommended that the teaching of grammatical principles start during the second semester of the first year of learning instead of at the very beginning.

The word order error rate for the grammatical domain is the second highest among the four domains, being 1.82 at level 1, dropping to 1.13 at level 2 and increasing to 2.28 at level 3. This suggests that level 1 learners had moderate difficulty in arranging word orders correctly for the structures they either could not remember well or composed creatively. This is another reason for the recommended timing of teaching the grammatical principles during the second semester of the first year instruction.

Given that in this study both GPP and MBH became more problematic at level 3 when learners were more competent and used more complex structures in their writing, the teaching of the two grammatical principles appears to require reinforcement as learners reach a higher proficiency level, especially advanced level. Under GPP, *Topic-comment* sub-principle needs more attention than *Question* sub-principle. Under MBH, *Modifiers* + *N* sub-principle deserves more attention than *De Position* sub-principle.

4.2. Teaching conceptual principles at intermediate level

The conceptual principles – *the Principle of Temporal Sequence* (PTS) and *the Whole-Before-Part Principle* (WBP) – are recommended to be taught at an intermediate proficiency level because these principles function at the cognitive level (Hu, 1995). After reaching an intermediate proficiency level, L2 learners have exposed themselves to the target language for a sufficient period of time to make sense of the grammar of the language. This proficiency level also enables learners to cognitively compare their native language (English) and the target language (Chinese), since the two languages conceptualize the world differently. Thus, an intermediate Chinese proficiency level is a prerequisite for learning the conceptual principles. L2 learners are more likely to understand the conceptual principles and apply them with less difficulty when they are provided with sufficient examples in Chinese to support them. Learners of lower proficiency level would be less likely to be able to understand the examples that demonstrate PTS and WPB.

The word order error rates for the conceptual domain are not only the highest but also present an increasing pattern from level 1 (6.77) to level 2 (7.80) to level 3 (10.45). Among the 408 word order errors collected, 249 (61%) word order errors occurred due to the violation of PTS and 70 (17.2%) word order errors occurred due to the violation of WBP. It appears that L2 learners encountered great difficulty in correctly arranging word orders in this domain across all three proficiency levels. It is compelling that PTS and WBP be explicitly taught to learners when they reach a proficiency sufficient for understanding the two conceptual principles. The minimal level is considered to be an intermediate proficiency level.

Moreover, under PTS, *Action Series*, *Modifiers of V* and *Subsidiary Relations* sub-principles are more problematic at level 3 and hence need more attention in the classroom than the remaining three sub-principles, namely *Locative Expressions*, *Time Expressions* and *Beneficiary,* as learners reach an advanced proficiency level. Under WBP, *Temporal Scope* and *Spatial Scope* appear to require more attention than the remaining two sub-principles, namely *Time* + *Place* + *Manner* + *V* and *General* + *Particular*, in order to overcome learners' L1-based conceptualizations in using L2.

4.3. Teaching functional principles at advanced level

The functional principles – the *Principle of Communicative Dynamism* (PCD) and the *Principle of Focus* (PF) – are recommended to be taught

to learners with an advanced proficiency level of Chinese, because these principles function at the pragmatic level (Hu, 1995). These principles help learners to use communicative (rhetorical) strategies that require a high proficiency in the target language. PCD and PF account for the nuances of sentences with the same lexical items but different word order arrangements. Learners with a lower proficiency level would find it difficult to understand these two principles, even with examples provided.

The word order error rates in this domain are quite low, especially at level 1 and level 2. This also indicates that the teaching of the functional principles needs to be postponed until an advanced proficiency level, when learners become sufficiently competent to make use of PCD and PF.

The above-recommended sequence refers to the initial timing of teaching of three domains of word order principles. One cannot expect the teaching of any Chinese word order principle be successfully completed in one lesson and hope that L2 learners can apply them correctly with confidence. The teaching of the word order principles requires strengthening from time to time, with more and more examples employed for illustration during the learning process. The grammatical and conceptual principles, in particular, need to be reinforced when learners reach an advanced proficiency level whereby they are able to use longer and more complicated structures in their target language. This is when more errors can occur due to the increase in complexity of the language used, as suggested by the findings of this study.

Whenever a common type of word order error occurs, analysis by learners, with teachers' guidance, is recommended as to the structure of the word order error, in order to identify which word order principle is violated. This kind of analysis can help the learners internalize the word order principles they have been taught.

The recommendations made here serve as a basis for future research on teaching Chinese word order. More research should be conducted to confirm these recommendations and ensure that they are appropriate for adult learners of Chinese as a foreign language.

5. Suggested topics for further research

There are several areas for further research on Chinese L2 word order acquisition that are highlighted by the findings of this project. Before concluding this book, three specific topics for further research are proposed below.

5.1. Instruction effect of the underlying word order principles

Since the teaching of Chinese word order principles has been recommended, it is possible to examine the instruction effect of the Chinese word order principles. Such a study would need to compare data obtained from two groups of learners. One group (e.g. Group A) would receive explicit instruction in word order principles while another group (e.g. Group B) would not (control group). After a certain period of time, if Group A performs better than Group B in their word order performances, the better performance of Group A could be claimed as an instruction effect of the word order principles, if the teacher and teaching materials are kept the same for the two groups. This type of research could start by focusing on principles like PTS and WBP that have wide application range in explaining word order errors.

5.2. A longitudinal study on Chinese L2 word order development

It is important to investigate the developmental sequence in Chinese L2 word order acquisition, although this book was not designed to do so. As a natural extension to this cross-sectional study, a longitudinal study on word order development employing Pienemann's (1998) emergence methodology is recommended. Such a study would need to follow a number of Chinese L2 learners, ideally beginners, for one, two or three years and obtain data bi-weekly or monthly. The data collecting tasks could be specially designed to focus on the acquisition of word order structures governed by certain principles – for example, PTS – and to investigate their acquisition patterns.

5.3. Study on criteria for categorizing other types of errors in Chinese L2

Truscott (1996) points out "There is some reason to think that syntactic, morphological, and lexical knowledge are acquired in different manners" (p. 343). Ferris (1999) supports this viewpoint by stating "From my own experiences as a teacher of L2 writing, I have become increasingly convinced of the truth of this statement [Truscott's statement above]" (p. 5). If this is the case, then no single criterion can be valid for categorizing all kinds of errors. In this study, Chinese L2 word order (syntactic) errors were categorized according to their viola-

tion of any basic word order principle (sub-principle or sub-principle type). What could be an appropriate criterion for categorizing phonological, morphological or lexical errors? In order to explore such criteria, one would need to investigate the operating system governing phonology, morphology or lexicon in Chinese; as a parallel to the one governing Chinese word order that has been established in this study. Such studies, although not being necessarily easy to conduct, could be a promising direction of research in understanding the acquisition process in these areas.

6. Concluding remarks

This book has achieved its research aims by answering the six research questions raised in the first chapter. The principal contribution has been the development of a new principle-based taxonomy of Chinese L2 word order errors. Due to the limitations of EA and sampling, the principle-based word order error taxonomy provides only one perspective of Chinese L2 word order acquisition. Other perspectives include how error-free structures of Chinese L2 word order develop. Nevertheless, the findings of this study have significant implications, both theoretical and pedagogical. Theoretically, the Cognitive Functionalist Approach is found to be highly valuable in explaining Chinese L2 word order errors. Pedagogically, an instructional sequence for teaching Chinese word order principles, the grammatical principles at an elementary level; the conceptual principles at an intermediate level; and the functional principles at an advanced level, has been recommended. Investigating the instruction effect of these principles is proposed as one of three suggested research topics for further exploration.

The findings of the present book provide a basis for Chinese L2 researchers and teachers to treat Chinese L2 word order errors in the classroom. It is hoped that future empirical studies will make use of the principle-based taxonomy developed in this study in order to enhance word order instruction by teaching word order principles and by providing effective feedback to Chinese L2 word order errors.

References

ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages)
1989 *ACTFL proficiency guidelines: OPI tester training manual*. Yonkers, NY: Author.

Bardovi-Harlig, K.
1992 A second look at T-unit analysis: reconsidering the sentence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(2), 390–395.

Bates, E., Friederici, A., & Wulfeck, B.
1987 Sentence comprehension in aphasia: a cross-linguistic study. *Brain and Language*, 32, 19–67.

Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B.
1982 Functionalist approaches to grammar. In E. Wanner & L. Gleitman (eds.), *Language acquisition: the state of art* (pp. 173–217). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B.
1989 Functionalism and the competition model. In B. MacWhinney & E. Bates (eds.), *The cross-linguistic study of sentence processing* (pp. 3–73). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bates, E., McNew, S., MacWhinney, B., Devescovi, A., & Smith, S.
1982 Functional constraints on sentence processing: a cross-linguistic study. *Cognition*, 11, 245–299.

Biq, Y., Tai, J. H-Y. & Thompson, S. A.
1996 Recent development in functional approaches to Chinese. In J. Huang & A. Li (eds.), *New horizons in Chinese linguistics* (pp. 97–140). Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Birdsong, D.
1989 *Metalinguistic performance and inter-linguistic competence*. New York: Springer.

Bley-Vroman, R. W.
1989 What is the logical problem of foreign language learning? In S. M. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 41–68). Cambridge, England; New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, L.
1933 *Language*. New York: Holt.

Borer, H.
1996 Access to Universal Grammar: the real issues. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 19, 718–720.

Boroditsky, L.
2001 Does language shape thought?: Mandarin and English speakers' conceptions of time. *Cognitive Psychology*, 43(1), 1–22.

Braidi, S. M.
1999 *The acquisition of second-language syntax*. London; New York: Arnold; New York, NY: Co-published in the U.S. by Oxford University Press.

Brown, H. D.
2000 *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D.
1986 *The grammar book: an ESL/EFL Teacher's course*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.

Chafe, W.
1970 *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, W.
1982 Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 35–52). Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX Pub. Corp.

Chao, Y. R.
1968 *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chen, R.
1995 Communicative dynamism and word order in Mandarin Chinese. *Language Sciences*, 17(2), 201–222.

Chomsky, N.
1965 *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N.
1981 *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht, Netherlands; Cinnaminson, U.S.A.: Foris.

Chu, C. C.
1983 *A reference grammar of Mandarin Chinese for English speakers*. New York: Peter Lang.

Chu, C. C.
1984 *Hanyu de cixu jiqi bianqian* (Chinese word order and word order change). *Yuyan Yanjiu (Language Research)*, 1, 127–151.

Chu, C. C.
1986 *Yuyanxue lunji: lilun, yingyong ji hanyu yufa* [*Lectures in linguistics: theories, applications, and Mandarin syntax*], Taipei: Crane.

Chu, C. C.
1998 *A discourse grammar of Mandarin Chinese*. New York: P. Lang.

Clahsen, H.
1980 Psycholinguistic aspects of L2 acquisition: word order phenomenon in foreign workers. In S. Felix (ed.), *Second language development: trends and issues* (pp. 57–79). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Clahsen, H.
1984 The acquisition of German word order: a test case for cognitive approaches to L2 development. In R. W. Andersen (ed.), *Second lan-*

guages: a cross-linguistic perspective (pp. 219–242). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Clahsen, H. & Muysken, P.
1986 The availability of universal grammar to adult and child learners – a study of the acquisition of German word order. *Second Language Research*, 2, 93–119.

Clahsen, H. & Muysken, P.
1989 The UG paradox in L2 acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 5, 1–29.

Clahsen, H. & Muysken, P.
1996 How adult second language learning differs from child first language development. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 19, 621–723.

Cohen, A. D.
1998 *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London; New York: Longman.

Cook, V.
1993 *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Corder, S. P.
1967 The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161–170.

Corder, S. P.
1971 Idiosyncratic errors and error analysis, *IRAL*, 9, 2, 147–159. Reprinted in J. C. Richards (1974) (ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 158–171). London: Longman.

Corder, S. P.
1973 *Introducing applied linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Corder, S. P.
1974 Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 158–171). London: Longman.

Corder, S. P.
1981 *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D.
2001 *Language and the internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daněs, F.
1987 On Prague School Functionalism in linguistics. In R. Dirven & V. Fried (eds.), *Functionalism in linguistics* (pp. 3–38). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dulay, H. and Burt, M.
1973 Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learning*, 23, 245–258.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M.
1974a Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24, 37–53.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M.
1974b Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterley*, 8, 129–136.
Dulay, H. & Burt, M.
1974c You can't learn without goofing. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. Longman Group Limited.
Dulay, H., Burt, M. & Krashen, S.
1982 *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Dušková, L.
1969 On sources of errors in foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 7, 11–36.
Ellis, R.
1989 Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 305–328.
Ellis, R.
1994 *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ellis, R.
1998 Emergentism, connectionism and language learning. *Language Learning*, 48, 631–664.
Ellis, R.
2005 Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, 33, 209–224. Encyclopedia, retrieved on 7 May 2005 at http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/iconicity
Epstein, S. D., Flynn, S. & Martohardjono, G.
1996 Second language acquisition: theoretical and experimental issues in contemporary research. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 19, 677–714.
Ertel, S.
1977 Where do the subjects of sentences come from? In S. Rosenberg (ed.), *Sentence production: developments in research and theory* (pp. 141–167). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
Felix, S. W.
1988 UG-generated knowledge in adult second language acquisition. In S. Flynn & W. O'Neil (eds.), *Linguistic theory in second language acquisition* (pp. 277–294). Dordrecht; Boston; London: Kluwer.
Ferris, D. R.
1995 Can advanced ESL students be taught to correct their most serious and frequent errors? *CATESOL Journal*, 8(1), 41–62.
Ferris, D. R.
1999 The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1–11.
Ferris, D. R. & Roberts, B.
2001 Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184.

Fillmore, C. J.
1975 *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis 1971*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Firbas, J.
1992 *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flynn, S.
1988 Nature of development in L2 acquisition and implications for theories on language acquisition in general. In S. Flynn and W. O'Neil (eds.), *Linguistic theory in second language acquisition* (pp. 79–89). Dordrecht; Boston; London: Kluwer.

Flynn, S.
1996 A parameter-setting approach in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 121–158). New York: Academic Press.

Freed, B. F.
1991 *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company.

Freidin, R.
1996 Adult language acquisition and universal grammar. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 19, 725–726.

Fries, C.
1945 *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gass, S.
1987 The resolution of conflicts among competing systems: A bi-directional perspective. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 329–350.

Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L.
1994 *Second language acquisition: an introductory course*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Gass, S. M.
1996 Second language acquisition and linguistic theory: the role of language transfer, in W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 317–345). San Diego: Academic Press.

Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L.
2001 *Second language acquisition: an introductory course*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Gay, L. S. & Airasian, P.
1999 *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gershkoff-Stowe, L. & Goldin-Medow, S.
2002 Is there a natural order for expressing semantic relations? *Cognitive Psychology*, 45, 375–412.

Gibson, E.
1992 On the adequacy of the Competition Model. *Language*, 68, 812–830.

Goh, Y.-S.
1999 Challenges of the rise of global Mandarin. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 34(3), 41–48.
Gregg, K.
1996 The logical and developmental problems of second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 49–81). New York: Academic Press.
Greenberg, J. H.
1963 *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Greenberg, J. H.
1966 *Universals of language: report of a conference held at Dobbs Ferry New York*, April 13–15, 1961. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
Haiman, J.
1983 Iconic and economic motivation. *Language*, 59, 781–819.
Haiman, J.
1985a *Natural syntax: iconicity and erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Haiman, J.
1985b (ed.). *Iconicity in syntax: proceedings of a symposium on iconicity in syntax, Stanford, June 24–6, 1983*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
Harrington, M.
1987 Processing transfer: language-specific processing strategies as a source of interlanguage variation. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 351–377.
Harrington, M.
2001 Sentence processing. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 91–124). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N.
1994 Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(2), 141–163.
Heilenman, L. & McDonald, J.
1993 Processing strategies in L2 learners of French: the role of transfer. *Language Learning*, 43, 507–557.
Heine, B., Claudi, U. & Hunnemeyer, F.
1991 *Grammaticalization: a conceptual framework*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
Henne, H., Rongen, O. B. and Jul, H. L.
1977 *A handbook on Chinese language structure*. Oslo: Scandanavian University Books.
Henrichsen, L.
1978 Distinctive features of written English. *TESL Reporter*, 11(4), 12–14.
Hernandez, A. Bates, E. & Avila, L.
1994 Online sentence interpretation in Spanish-English bilinguals: what does it mean to be "in between"? *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 15, 417–446.

Hertel, T. J.
2003 Lexical and discourse factors in the second language acquisition of Spanish word order. *Second Language Research*, 19(4), 273–304.
Ho, Y.
1993 *Aspects of discourse structure in Mandarin Chinese*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen University Press.
Hopper, P. J. & Thompson, S. A.
1980 Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 56, 251–299.
Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A.
1984 The discourse basis for lexical categories in Universal Grammar.. *Language*, 60, 703–752.
Hu, M.
1992 Word order, discourse and language learning. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 27(1–2), 71–84.
Hu, W.
1995 *Functional perspectives and Chinese word order*. Unpublished doctoral book, Ohio State University.
Huang, C.-T. J.
1982 *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.
Huang, S.
1983 *Yuyan zhexue [Philosophy of language]*, Taipei: Crane.
Huang, C.-T. J.
1984 On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 15, 531–574.
Huang, S.
1987 Two studies on prototype semantics: *xiao* "filial piety" and *mei mianzi* "loss of face", *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 15, 55–90.
Hudson, G.
2000 *Essential introductory linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Hulk, A.
1991 Parameter setting and the acquisition of word order in L2 French. *Second Language Research*, 7(1), 1–34.
Hunt, K. W.
1970 Recent measures in syntactic development. In M. Lester (ed.), *Readings in applied transformational grammar* (pp. 187–200). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
Iljic, R.
1988 Is there a lexical category of absolute adjective in Mandarin Chinese? *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 16, 151–166.
James, C.
1998 *Errors in language learning and use: exploring error analysis*. London: New York: Longman.
Jiang, W.
2004 Teaching Chinese word order principles: a linguistic review. In J. A. Vadeloncoeur & P. Jervis-Tracy (eds.), *Crossing boundaries in edu-*

cational research: perspectives across paradigms (pp. 229–258). Brisbane: Australian Academic Press PTY LTD.

Jin, H. G.
1994 Topic-prominence and subject-prominence in L2 acquisition: evidence of English-to-Chinese typological transfer. *Language Learning*, 44(1), 101–122.

Jung, E. H.
2004 Topic and subject prominence in interlanguage development. *Language Learning*, 54(4), 713–738.

Kellerman, E.
1995 Crosslinguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 125–150.

Kellerman, E. & Sharwood-Smith, M.
1986 *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Kempe, V., & MacWhinney, B.
1998 The acquisition of case marking by adult learners of Russian and German. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *20*, 543–587.

Kilborn, K.
1989 Sentence processing strategies in adult bilinguals. In B. MacWhinney & E. Bates (eds.), *The crosslinguistic study of sentence processing* (pp. 257–291). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kilborn, K., and Cooreman, A.
1987 Sentence interpretation strategies in adult Dutch-English bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 415–431.

Kirkpatrick, T. A.
1993 *Information sequencing in Modern Standard Chinese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University.

Kiss, K. E.,
1998 Identificational focus and information focus. *Language*, 74, 245–273.

Kitić, S.
2002 On function of word order in English and Serbian. *Linguistics and Literature*, 2(9), 303–312.

Ko, T. J.
1997 *Error analysis and its application to Chinese language teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University.

Koffka, K.
1935 *Principles of gestalt psychology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Krashen, S. D.
1982 *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Sydney: Pergamon.

Kuno, S.
1987 *Functional syntax: anaphora, discourse, and empathy*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.

Lado, R.
1957 *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lakoff, G.
1970 *Irregularity in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
Lakoff, G.
1987 *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
Langacker, R. W.
1987 *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
Langacker, R. W.
1999 *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
LaPolla, R. J.
1995 Pragmatic relations and word order in Chinese. In P. Downing & M. Noonan (eds.), *Word order in discourse* (pp. 299–331). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H.
1991 *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
Lee, D.
2001 *Cognitive linguistics: an introduction*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
Lee, I.
1997 ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*, 15, 465–477.
Lee, I.
2004 Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: the case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285–312.
Leki, I.
1991 The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203–218.
Lennon, P.
1991 Error: some problems of definition, identification, and distinction. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 180–196.
Li, A. Y-H.
1990 *Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese*. Dordrecht, Boston, and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A.
1974 Co-verbs in Mandarin Chinese: verbs or prepositions? *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 2, 61–129.
Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A.
1976 Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In C. N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic* (pp. 457–461). New York: Academic Press.
Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A.
1981 *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Li, C. N., & Thompson, S. A.
1985 On the issue of word order in synchronic grammar: a case against movement transformations. In S. Teng (ed.), *Reading in Chinese transformational syntax* (pp. 508–520). The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd.

Li, P.
1998 Crosslinguistic variation and sentence processing: the case of Chinese. In Hillert, D. (ed.), *Syntax and semantics: a crosslinguistic perspective* (pp. 33–53). London: Academic Press.

Li, P., Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B.
1993 Processing a language without inflections: a reaction time study of sentence interpretation in Chinese. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 32, 169–192.

Li, W.
1999 Second language acquisition of discourse- and pragmatically-governed word order in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*. 34(2), 37–70.

Li, Y., Cheng, R. L., Foster, L., Ho, S. H., Hou, J. Y., & Yip, M.
1983 *Mandarin Chinese: a practical reference grammar for students and teachers*, Vol. I, Taipei: Crane.

Li, Y., Cheng, R. L., Foster, L., Ho, S. H., Hou, J. Y., & Yip, M.
1989 *Mandarin Chinese: a practical reference grammar for students and teachers*, Vol. II, Taipei: Crane.

Liceras, J. M.
1989 On some properties of the "pro-drop" parameter: looking for missing subjects in non-native Spanish. In S. M. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 109–133). Cambridge; New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Light, T.
1979 Word order and word order change in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 7, 149–180.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N.
2002 *How languages are learned* (Revised edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lin, H.
1981 *Essential grammar for modern Chinese*. Boston: Cheng and Tsui Co.

Liu, H., Bates, E., & Li. P.
1992 Sentence interpretation in bilingual speakers of English and Chinese. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 13, 451–484.

LoCoco, V.
1976 A comparison of three methods for the collection of L2 data: free composition, translation and picture description. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 8, 59–86.

Long, M. H.
1990a The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 649–666.

Long, M. H.
1990b Maturational constraints on language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251–285.

Lu, J.
1997 *Waiguoren hanyu yufa pianwu fenxi* [Error analysis on foreign learners' grammar of Chinese]. In J. Wang (ed.), *Hanyu zuo wei di er yuyan de xide yanjiu* [*Research on acquisition of Chinese as a second language*] (pp. 76–92). *Beijing Yuyan Wenhua Daxue Chubanshe* [Beijing: Beijing Language and Culture University Press].

Lu, J. H.
1980 A study of quantifiers in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 15(3), 1–23.

Lü, J. (ed.)
1956 *Hanyu de Zhuyu Binyu Wenti* (The problem of the subject and object in Chinese), comp. Zhongguo Yuwen, Beijing: Zhonghua Press.

Lü, S.
1980 *Xiandai hanyu babaici [800 words in modern Chinese]*. Beijing: Shangwu.

Lust, B. & Chien, Y.
1984 The structure of coordination in first language acquisition of Mandarin Chinese: evidence for a universal. *Cognition*, 17, 49–83.

Machida, S.
1995 *A case study of interlanguage Japanese language acquisition by English speakers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Queensland, Australia.

Machida, S.
2001 Japanese text comprehension by Chinese and non-Chinese background learners. *System*, 29(1), 103–118.

MacWhinney, B.
1987 The competition model. In B. MacWhinney (ed.), *Mechanisms of language acquisition* (pp. 249–308). New Jersey: Erlbaum.

MacWhinney, B.
1997 Second language acquisition and the competition model. In A. M. B. de Groot & J. F. Kroll (eds.), *Tutorials in bilingualism: psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 113–144). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

MacWhinney, B.
2001 The competition model: the input, the context, and the brain. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 69–90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacWhinney, B., & Bates, E.
1989 *The crosslinguistic study of sentence processing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mangione, S.
1982 The syntax, semantics and pragmatics of causative, passive and "Ba" constructions in Mandarin. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.

Marshall, S. & Gilmour, M.
1993 Lexical knowledge and reading comprehension in Papua New Guinea. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12(1), 69–81.
Mathesius, V.
1975 *A functional analysis of present-day English on a general linguistic basis*. Translated by L. Dušková and J. Vachek, Prague: Academia.
McCawley, J. D.
1992 Justifying part-of-speech assignments in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, 20, 247–287.
McClelland, J. J., Rumelhart, D. E., & Hinton, G.
1986 The appeal of parallel distributed processing. In D. E. Rumelhart & J. L. McClelland (eds.), *Parallel distributed processing* (pp. 3–44). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
McDonald, J.
1987 Assigning linguistic roles: the influence of conflicting cues. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 26, 100–117.
McDonald, J., & Heilenman, K.
1991 Determinants of cue strength in adult first and second language speakers of French. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 12, 313–348.
McGinnis, S.
1988 Sentential word order in Chinese: Towards a theoretical/pedagogical interface. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 23(1), 41–56.
McGinnis, S.
1999 Student goals and approaches. In M. Chu (ed.), *Mapping the course of the Chinese language field* (pp. 151–175). (Chinese Language Teachers Association Monograph Series, Volume III), Kalamazoo, MI: Chinese Language Teachers Association.
McLaughlin, B.
1987 *Theories of second language learning*. Melbourne: Arnold.
McLaughlin, B., & Harrington, M.
1989 Second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 122–134.
Mei, K.
1980 Is modern Chinese really a SOV language? *Cashiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale*, 7, 23–45.
Meisel, J. M., Clahsen, H. & Pienemann, M.
1981 On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3, 109–135.
Miao, X.
1981 Word order and semantic strategies in Chinese sentence comprehension. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 8, 109–122.
Miller, S.
1987 Developmental research methods. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Myles, F., Hooper, J. & Mitchell, R.
1998 Rote or rule? Exploring the role of formulaic language in classroom foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 323–363.
Myles, F., Mitchell, R. & Hooper, J.
1999 Interrogative chunks in French L2: a basis for creative construction? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(1), 49–80.
Nemser, W.
1974 Approximative systems of foreign language learners. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 55–63). London: Longman.
Newmeyer, F. J.
1996 Some incorrect implications of the full-access hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 19, 736–737.
Ning, C.
1993 *The overt syntax of relativization and topicalization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
Norris, J., & Ortega, L.
2000 Effectiveness of L2 instruction: a research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417–528.
Nunan, D.
1996 Issues in second language acquisition research: examining substance and procedure. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 349–374). New York: Academic Press.
Odlin, T.
1989 *Language transfer: cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Palmberg, R.
1980 *A select bibliography of error analysis and interlanguage* studies. Abo: Abo Akademi.
Pica, T.
1983 Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning, 33*(4), 465–497.
Pienemann, M.
1998 *Language processing and second language development: processability theory*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
Pienemann, M. and Håkansson, G.
1996 A unified approach toward the development of Swedish as L2: a processability account. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21, 383–420.
Polio, C.
1994 Non-native speakers' use of nominal classifiers in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of the Chinese Teachers Association*, 29, 51–66.
Qian, X.
1999 *Hanwai yuyan duibi, pianwu fenxi, zhongjieyu he di er yuyan xide lilun cankao wenxian* (1977–1998) (Bibliography: Contrastive analy-

sis of Chinese and foreign languages, error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition theories). In Q. Zhang & S. Wang (eds.), *Hanwai yuyan: duibi yu pianwu fenxi lunwen ji*. (Chinese and foreign languages: the collection of contrastive and error analysis papers). Beijing: Beijing University Press.

Qu, Y.
1994 *Object noun phrase dislocation in Mandarin Chinese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.

Radecki, P. & Swales, J.
1988 ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16, 255–365.

Rennie, C. E.
2000 *Error correction in ESL writing: students views*. MA thesis, Department of English, California State University, Sacramento.

Redeker, G.
1984 On differences between spoken and written language. *Discourse processes*, 7(1), 43–55.

Richards, J. C.
1974 A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 172–188). London: Longman.

Roberts, C.
1998 Form, the flow of information, and universal grammar. In P. Culicover and L. McNally (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 29: the limits of syntax* (pp. 109–160). New York: Academic Press.

Rounds, P., & Kanagy, R.
1998 Acquiring linguistic cues to identify AGENT: evidence from children learning Japanese as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 509–542.

Rutherford, W.
1983 Language typology and language transfer. In S. M. Gass and L. Selinker (eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 358–370). Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.

Rutherford, W.
(1989 Interlanguage and pragmatic word order. In S. M. Gass and J. Schachter (eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 163–182). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Sakai, K. L., Homae, F. & Hashimoto, R.
2003 Sentence processing is uniquely human. *Neuroscience Research*, 46, 273–279.

Sapir, E.
1921 *Language: an introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Sasaki, Y.
1991 English and Japanese comprehension strategies: an analysis based on the competition model. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 12, 47–73.

Sasaki, Y.
1994 Paths of processing strategy transfers in learning Japanese and English as foreign languages: A competition model approach. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 43–72.

Schachter, J.
1974 An error in error analysis. *Language Learning*, 24, 205–214.

Schachter, J.
1986 In search of systematicity in interlanguage production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8, 119–134.

Schachter, J.
1989 Testing a proposed universal. In S. M. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 73–88). Cambridge, England; New York; Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Schachter, J.
1992 A new account of language transfer. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 32–46). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schachter, J.
1996 Maturation and the issue of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 159–188). New York: Academic Press.

Schachter, J. & Celce-Murcia, M.
1977 Some reservations concerning error analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 441–451.

Scott, A.
1989 The vertical dimension and time in Mandarin. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 9, 295–314.

Selinker, L.
1974 Interlanguage. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 31–54). London: Longman.

Selinker, L.
1992 *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman.

Sharwood-Smith, M.
1994 *Second language learning: theoretical foundations*. London, England: Longman.

Shi, D.
2000 Topic and topic-comment constructions in Mandarin Chinese. *Language*, 76(2), 383–408.

Shyu, S.
1995 *The syntax of focus and topic in Mandarin Chinese*. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Siewierska, A.
1988 *Word order rules*. London; New York; Sydney: Croom Helm.

Skehan, P.
1998 *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, S. D., & Mimica, I.
1984 Agrammatism in a case-inflected language: comprehension of agent-object relations. *Brain and Language*, 21(2), 274–290.

Stern, H.
1983 *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Su, I.-R.
1998 *Transfer of sentence processing strategies: a comparison of L2 learners of Chinese and English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Hawaii.

Su, I.-R.
2001 Transfer of sentence processing strategies: a comparison of L2 learners of Chinese and English. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 22, 83–112.

Sun, C. & Givón, T.
1985 On the so-called SOV word order in Mandarin Chinese: A quantified text study and its implications. *Language*, 61, 329–351.

Sussex, R.
2005 Personal communication. 16 May 2005.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1973 Chinese as a SOV language. *Chicago Linguistic Society*, 9, 659–671.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1982 Relevant categorical distinctions in Chinese. *Papers from the Eighteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 495–506.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1985 Temporal sequences and Chinese word order. In J. Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax* (pp. 49–72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1989a Toward a cognition-based functional grammar of Chinese. In J. Tai, & F. Hsueh (eds.), *Functionalism and Chinese grammar* (pp. 187–226). *Chinese Language Teachers' Association Monograph Series*. Vol. 1. Kalamazoo, MI: Chinese Language Teachers Association.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1989b Iconicity: motivation in Chinese syntax. Manuscript. Ohio State University.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1992a Variation in classifier systems across Chinese dialects: towards a cognition-based semantic approach, in *Chinese languages and linguistics 1: Chinese Dialect, Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philosophy No. 2* (pp. 587–608). Taipei, Taiwan: Academia Sinica.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1992b Category shifts and word-formation redundancy rules in Chinese. In H. S. Wang & F. Tsao (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 1–19). Taiwan: National Tsing Hua University.

Tai, J. H-Y.
1993 iconicity: motivations in Chinese grammar. In M. Eid & G. Iverson (eds.), *Principles and prediction: the analysis of natural languages* (pp. 153–174). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Tai, J. H-Y. & Wang, L.
1990 A semantic study of the classifier *tiao*. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*. 15, 35–56.
Talmy, L.
2003 *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Tarone, E. E.
1980 Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30, 417–431.
Tarone, E. E.
1988 *Variation in Interlanguage*. London: Edward Arnold.
Tarone, E. E.
1990 On variation in interlanguage: a response to Gregg. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 392–400.
Teng, S.
1974 Double nominatives in Chinese. *Language*, 50, 455–473.
Thompson, S. A.
1978 Modern English from a typological point of view: some implications of the function of word order. *Lingustische Berichte*, 54, 19–35.
Thompson, S. A.
1988 A discourse approach to the cross-linguistic category "adjective". In J. Hawkins (ed.), *Explaining language universals* (pp. 167–185). Oxford; New York: B. Blackwell.
Tomlin, R. S.
1986 *Basic word order: functional principles*. London; Sydney: Croom Helm.
Towell, R. & Hawkins, R.
1994 *Approaches to second language acquisition*. Clevedon, England; Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.
Truscott, J.
1996 The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, 46, 327–369.
Tsao, F.
1979 *A functional study of topic in Chinese: the first step towards discourse analysis*. Taipei: Student Books.
Tsao, F.
1990 *Sentence and clause structure in Chinese: a functional perspective*. Taibei: Student Book Co.
Tudor, I.
1989 Pre-reading: a categorization of formats. *System*, 17(3), 323–338.
Vachek, J.
1987 Written language seen from the functionalist angle. In R. Dirven & V. Fried (eds.), *Functionalism in linguistics* (pp. 395–405). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vaid, J. & Chengappa, S.
1988 Assigning linguistic roles: sentence interpretation in normal and aphasic Kannada-English bilinguals. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 3, 161–183.

Wang, M.
1988 Comments on Sun and Givon's study of the OV constructions in Mandarin. *Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 23(2), 33–53.

White, L.
1988 Island effects in second language acquisition. In S. Flynn & W. O'Neil (eds.), *Linguistic theory in second language acquisition* (pp. 144–172). Dordrecht; Boston; London: Kluwer.

White, L.
1991a Adverb placement in second language acquisition: some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7, 133–161.

White, L.
1991b Second language competence versus second language performance: UG or processing strategies? In L. Eubank (ed.), *Point and counterpoint: Universal Grammar in the second language* (pp. 167–189). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

White, L.
1996 Universal Grammar and second language acquisition: current trends and new directions. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 85–120). New York: Academic Press.

Xie, T.
1992 *An examination of the topic-prominence of Chinese language learners' Interlanguage*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.

Xu, L.
1995 Definiteness effects on Chinese word order. *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale*, 24(1), 29–48.

Xu, L.
2003 Manifestation of informational focus. *Lingua*, 114(3), 277–299.

Xu, L. & Liu, D.
1997 *Topic: structural and functional analyses*. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.

Xu, Y.
1988 The position of the adverb in Chinese foreign language development. *Working Papers in Language and Linguistics*, 24, 18–29.

Yu, S.
1986 Word order and topic prominence in the interlanguage of an Australian learner of Chinese. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 83–91.

Zhang, B. & Fang, M.
1996 *Studies in Chinese functional grammar*. Nanchang: Jiangxi Education Press.

Zhang, P. N.
1994 *Word order variation and end focus in Chinese: pragmatic functions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia University Teachers College.

Zhang, Y.
1995 Indirectness in Chinese requesting. In G. Kasper (ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language* (pp. 69–118). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Zhang, Y.
2001 *Second language acquisition of Chinese grammatical morphemes: a processability perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Australian National University.

Appendix: Word order error corpus

* Note: 1. The numbers in the category column stand for the category numbers listed in Table 6.2 on page 149.
2. E stands for 'erroneous' and C stands for 'correct'.
3. When a sentence contains two word order errors that fall within different categories, it was treated as two errors with each being put in its respective category.

From level 1 learners (58 word order errors in total)

Category Word order errors and corresponding correct forms*

1.1 1. E: 什么买给他?
Shenme mai gei ta?
What buy for him
What (shall we) buy for him?

C: 给他买什么?
Gei ta mai shenme?
For him buy what?
What (shall we) buy for him?

2. E: 什么你买东西?
Shenme ni mai dongxi?
What you buy thing
What do you want to buy?

C: 你买什么东西?
Ni mai shenme dongxi?
You buy what thing
What do you want to buy?

1.2 3. E: 妈妈的表是很好样子。
Mama de biao shi henhao yangzi.
Mum de watch is very good appearance
The style of (my) Mum's watch is very good.

C: 妈妈的表样子很好。
Mama de biao yangzi hen hao.
Mum *de* watch appearance very good
The style of (my) Mum's watch is very good.

4. E: Canberra 有小人口。
Canberra you xiao renkou.
Canberra have small population
Canberra has a small population.

C: 堪培拉人口很少。
Kanpeila renkou hen shao.
Canberra population very small
Canberra has a small population.

5. E: 红色和绿色我都喜欢穿的衣服。
Hongse he lüse wo dou xihuan chuan de yifu.
Red and green I all like wear *de* clothes
I like to wear both red and green clothes.

C: 红色和绿色的衣服我都喜欢穿。
Hongse he lüse de yifu wo dou xihuan chuan.
Red and green *de* clothes I all like wear
I like to wear both red and green clothes.

2.1 6. E: 我中文的名字是吕书恬。
Wo Zhongwen de mingzi shi Lü Shutian.
I Chinese *de* name is *Lü Shutian*
My Chinese name is *Lü Shutian*.

C: 我的中文名字是吕书恬。
Wo de Zhongwen mingzi shi Lü Shutian.
I *de* Chinese name is *Lü Shutian*
My Chinese name is *Lü Shutian*.

7. E: 我来介绍一下儿, 这是我日本的朋友美美。
Wo lai jieshao yi xiar, zhe shi wo Riben de pengyou Meimei.
I come introduce once, this is I Japan *de* friend *Meimei*
Let me introduce (a friend), this is my Japanese friend *Meimei*.

C: 我来介绍一下儿, 这是我的日本朋友美美。
Wo lai jieshao yi xiar, zhe shi wo de Riben pengyou Meimei.
I come introduce once, this is I *de* Japan friend *Meimei*
Let me introduce (a friend), this is my Japanese friend *Meimei*.

8. E: 我的喜爱动物是老虎。
Wo de xiai dongwu shi laohu.
I *de* like animal is tiger
The animal I like is the tiger.

C: 我喜爱的动物是老虎。
Wo xiai de dongwu shi laohu.
I like *de* animal is tiger
The animal I like is the tiger.

9. E: 后天是我的哥哥生日。
Houtian shi wo de gege shengri.
Back day is I *de* elder brother birthday
The day after tomorrow is my elder brother's birthday.

C: 后天是我哥哥的生日。
Houtian shi wo gege de shengri.
Back day is I elder brother *de* birthday
The day after tomorrow is my elder brother's birthday.

2.2 10. E: 我是服务员的日本饭店。
Wo shi fuwuyuan de Riben fandian.
I is waitress *de* Japan restaurant
I am a waitress at a Japanese restaurant.

C: 我是日本饭店的服务员。
Wo shi Riben fandian de fuwuyuan.
I is Japan restaurant *de* waitress
I am a waitress at a Japanese restaurant.

11. E: 寄信给叔叔西安。
Ji xin gei shushu Xi'an.
Post letter for Uncle Xi'an
(I will) post the letter to (my) Uncle who lives in Xi'an.

C: 给西安的叔叔寄信。
Gei Xi'an de shushu Ji xin.
For Xi'an *de* uncle post letter
(I will) post the letter to (my) uncle who lives in Xi'an.

3.1.1 12. E: 我们搬家我上完小学。
Women ban jia wo shang wan xiao xue.
We move home I finish primary school
We moved house after I had finished (my) primary school.

C: 我上完小学我们搬家了。
Wo shang wan xiao xue women ban jia le.
I finish primary school we move home LE
We moved house after I had finished (my) primary school.

13. E: 我男朋友说:"试试穿上。" (shopping for a coat).
Wo nan pengyou shuo: "shi shi chuan shang."
I male friend say: "try put on"
My boyfriend said: "Try it on."

C: 我男朋友说:"穿上试试。"
Wo nan pengyou shuo: "chuan shang shi shi."
I male friend say: "put on try"
My boyfriend said: "Try it on."

3.1.2 14. E: 大学不远从[离]我的房子。
Daxue bu yuan li wo de fangzi.
University not far from my house
The university is not far from my house.

C: 大学离我的房子不远。
Daxue li wo de fangzi bu yuan.
University from my house not far
The university is not far from my house.

3.1.3 15. E: 大学毕业以后我很想回去那里。
Daxue biye yihou wo hen xiang hui qu nali.
University graduate after I very much want to back go there
I would very much like to go back there after I graduate from the university.

C: 大学毕业以后我很想回那里去。
Daxue biye yihou wo hen xiang hui nali qu.
University graduate after I very much want to back there go
I would very much like to go back there after I graduate from the university.

16. E: 我父母回去美国了。
Wo fumu hui qu Meiguo le.
I parents back go America LE
My parents went back to America.

C: 我父母回美国去了。
Wo fumu hui Meiguo qu le.
I parents back America go LE
My parents went back to America.

3.1.4 17. E: 星期天我去了看妈妈。
Xingqitian wo qu le kan mama.
Sunday I go LE see Mum
I went to see Mum on Sunday.

C1: 星期天我去看了妈妈。
Xingqitian wo qu kan le mama.
Sunday I go see LE Mum
I went to see Mum on Sunday.

C2: 星期天我去看妈妈了。
Xingqitian wo qu kan mama le.
Sunday I go see Mum LE
I went to see Mum on Sunday.

3.2.1 18. E: 我想找个伴侣在我朋友婚礼上。
Wo xiang zhao ge banlü zai wo pengyou hunli shang.
I want find M partner at I friend wedding
I would like to find a partner at my friend's wedding.

C: 我想在我朋友婚礼上找个伴侣。
Wo xiang zai wo pengyou hunli shang zhao ge banlü.
I want at I friend wedding find M partner
I would like to find a partner at my friend's wedding.

19. E: 我的哥哥住和工作英国。
Wo de gege zhu he gongzuo Yingguo.
My elder brother live and work England
My elder brother lives and works in England.

C: 我哥哥在英国住, 也在那儿工作。
Wo gege zai Yinggo zhu, ye zai nar gongzuo.
My elder brother in England live, also there work
My elder brother lives and works in England.

20. E: 你做什么在这里?
Ni zuo shenme zai zheli?
You do what in here
What are you doing here?

C: 你在这里做什么?
Ni zai zheli zuo shenme?
You in here do what
What are you doing here?

3.2.2 21. E: 我中国城去买生日礼物。
Wo Zhongguocheng qu mai shengri liwu.
I Chinatown go buy birthday gift
I will go to Chinatown to buy a birthday gift.

C: 我去中国城买生日礼物。
Wo qu Zhongguocheng mai shengri liwu.
I go Chinatown buy birthday gift
I will go to Chinatown to buy a birthday gift.

3.3.1 22. E: 我喜欢锻炼和扮演[踢]足球每星期六。
Wo xihuan duanlian he ti zuqiu mei xingqiliu.
I like exercise and play football every Saturday
I like to do exercise and play football every Saturday.

C: 我喜欢每星期六锻炼和踢足球。
Wo xihuan mei xingqiliu duanlian he ti zuqiu.
I like every Saturday exercise and play football
I like to do exercise and play football every Saturday.

23. E: 所以我没用钱今天。
Suoyi wo mei yong qian jintian.
Therefore I not use money today
Therefore, I did not spend any money today.

C: 所以我今天没用钱。
Suoyi wo jintian mei yong qian.
Therefore I today not use money
Therefore, I did not spend any money today.

24. E: 我买了生日蛋糕那天。
Wo mai le shengri dangao natian.
I buy Le birthday cake that day
I bought a birthday cake on that day.

C: 我那天买了生日蛋糕。
Wo natian mai le shengri dangao.
I that day buy Le birthday cake
I bought a birthday cake on that day.

25. E: 我们去买星期二吧。
Women qu mai xingqier ba.
We go buy Tuesday *ba*
Let's go and buy (it) on Tuesday.

C: 我们星期二去买吧。
Women xingqier qu mai ba.
We Tuesday go buy PL
Let's go and buy (it) on Tuesday.

26. E: 咱们去星期五。
Zanmen qu xingqiwu.
We go Friday
We are going (there) on Friday.

C: 咱们星期五去。
Zanmen xingqiwu qu.
We Friday go
We are going (there) on Friday.

27. E: 我去冲浪每天。
Wo qu chong lang meitian.
I go surf every day.
I go surfing every day.

C: 我每天去冲浪。
Wo meitian qu chong lang.
I go every day surf
I go surfing every day.

3.3.2 28. E: 我们一十八年住英国。
Women yishiba nian zhu Yingguo.
We eighteen years live the UK
We have lived in the UK for eighteen years.

C: 我们住在英国十八年了。
Women zhu zai Yingguo shiba nian le.
We live in the UK eighteen years LE
We have lived in the UK for eighteen years.

29. E: 我三年在大学已经学。
Wo san nian zai daxue yijing xue.
I three years at university already study
I have already studied for three years in university.

C: 我在大学已经学了三年。
Wo zai daxue yijing xue le san nian.
I at university already study three years
I have already studied for three years in university.

30. E: 这个七月三个星期我去中国住。
Zhe ge qi yue san ge xingqi wo qu Zhongguo zhu.
This M July three M week I go China live
I will go to and stay in China for three weeks this July.

C: 这个七月我去中国住三个星期。
Zhe ge qi yue wo qu Zhongguo zhu san ge xingqi.
This M July I go China live three M week
I will go to and stay in China for three weeks this July.

31. E: 我一个星期的两个日[两天]工作。
Wo yi ge xingqi de liang tian gongzuo.
I one M week *de* two days work
I work two days every week.

C: 我一个星期工作两天。
Wo yi ge xingqi gongzuo liang tian.
I one M week *de* two days work
I work two days every week.

32. E: 我一个年在美国, 那个年是好玩儿。
Wo yi ge nian zai Meiguo, na ge nian shi hao wanr.
I one M year at America, that M year is fun.
I stayed in America for a year and that year was fun.

C: 我在美国住了一年, 那年很好玩儿。
Wo zai Meiguo zhu le yi nian, na nian hen hao wanr.
I at America stay LE one year, that year very fun.
I stayed in America for a year and that year was fun.

33. E: 我在老家四个年工作。
Wo zai laojia si ge nian gongzuo.
I at hometown four M year work
I worked at (my) hometown for four years.

C: 我在老家工作四年。
Wo zai laojia gongzuo si nian.
I at hometown work four year
I worked at (my) hometown for four years.

34. E: 我十五年游泳了。
Wo shi wu nian youyong le.
I fifteen years swim LE
I have been swimming for 15 years.

C: 我游泳游了十五年了。
Wo youyong you le shi wu nian le.
I swimming swim LE fifteen years LE
I have been swimming for 15 years.

35. E: 回悉尼后, 我在那儿三个年工作。
Hui Sydney hou, wo zai nar san ge nian gongzuo.
Return Sydney after, I at there three M year work
After returning to Sydney, I worked there for three years.

C: 回悉尼后, 我在那儿工作了三年。
Hui xini hou, wo zai nar gongzuo le san nian.
Return Sydney after, I at there work LE three year
After returning to Sydney, I worked there for three years.

3.3.3 No word order error was found in this category.

3.4 36. E: 姐姐说他[她]想买个大衣给妈妈。
Jiejie shuo ta xiang mai ge dayi gei mama.
Elder sister says she want buy M coat for Mum
(My) elder sister says that she wants to buy a coat for Mum.

C. 姐姐说她想给妈妈买个大衣。
Jiejie shuo ta xiang gei mama mai ge dayi.
Elder sister says she want for Mum buy M coat
(My) elder sister says that she wants to buy a coat for Mum.

37. E: 妈妈买了一件毛衣给我。
Mama mai le yijian maoyi gei wo.
Mum buy LE one M sweater for me
(My) Mum bought me a sweater.

C: 妈妈给我买了一件毛衣。
Mama gei wo mai le yijian maoyi.
Mum for me buy LE one M sweater
(My) Mum bought a sweater for me.

38. E: 爸爸买了一块手表给我。
Baba mai le yi kuai shoubiao gei wo.
Dad buy LE one M watch for me
(My) Dad bought a watch for me.

C: 爸爸给我买了一块手表。
Baba gei wo mai le yi kuai shoubiao.
Dad for me buy LE one M watch
(My) Dad bought a watch for me.

39. E: 她买了一只钢笔给她朋友。
Ta mai le yi zhi gangbi gei ta pengyou.
She buy LE one M pen for her friend
She bought a pen for her friend.

C: 她给她朋友买了一只钢笔。
Ta gei ta pengyou mai le yi zhi gangbi.
She for her friend buy LE one M pen
She bought a pen for her friend.

40. E: 我去买爱美一个蛋糕。
Wo qu mai Aimei yi ge dangao.
I go buy Amy one M cake
I will go to buy Amy a cake.

C: 我去给爱美买一个蛋糕。
Wo qu gei Aimei mai yi ge dangao.
I go for Amy buy one M cake
I will go to buy Amy a cake.

41. E: 我们可以买他一个剑。
Women keyi mai ta yi ge jian.
We can buy him one M sword
We can buy him a sword.

C: 我们可以给他买一个剑。
Women keyi gei ta mai yi ge jian.
We can buy him one M sword
We can buy him a sword.

42. E: 我们可以买他一个大衣。
Women keyi mai ta yi ge dayi.
We can buy him one M coat
We can buy him a coat.

C: 我们可以给他买一个大衣。
Women keyi gei ta mai yi ge dayi.
We can for him buy one M coat
We can buy him a coat.

3.5.1 43. E: 我家有一共六个人。
Wo jia you yigong liu ge ren.
I family have altogether six M people
There are altogether six people in my family.

C: 我家一共有六个人。
Wo jia yigong you liu ge ren.
I family altogether have six M people
There are altogether six people in my family.

44. E: 他天天喜欢看报。
Ta tiantian xihuan kan bao.
He everyday like read newspaper
He likes to read the newspaper every day.

C: 他喜欢天天看报。
Ta xihuan tiantian kan bao.
He like everyday read newspaper
He likes to read the newspaper every day.

45. E: 三年前我来澳大利亚跟我的朋友。
San nian qian wo lai aodaliya gen wo de pengyou.
Three year ago I come Australia with my friend
I came to Australia with my friend three years ago.

C: 三年前我跟我的朋友来澳大利亚。
San nian qian wo gen wo de pengyou lai aodaliya.
Three year ago I with my friend come Australia
I came to Australia with my friend three years ago.

46. E: 一共三本书要四十五块五毛钱。
Yigong san ben shu yao sishiwu kuai wu mao qian.
Altogether three M book want forty-five fifty money
The three books cost altogether forty-five fifty.

C: 三本书一共要四十五块五毛钱。
san ben shu yigong yao sishiwu kuai wu mao qian.
Three M book altogether want forty-five fifty money
The three books cost altogether forty-five fifty.

47. E: 上个月我们去美国坐飞机。
Shang ge yue women qu Meiguo zuo feiji.
Last month we go America sit plane
We went to America by plane last month.

C: 上个月我们坐飞机去美国。
Shang ge yue women zuo feiji qu Meiguo.
Last month we sit plane go America
We went to America by plane last month.

48. E: 我的姐姐住和她的男朋友。
Wo de jiejie zhu he ta de nan pengyou.
My elder sister live with her boyfriend
My elder sister lives with her boyfriend.

C: 我的姐姐和她的男朋友住。
Wo de jiejie he ta de nan pengyo zhuu.
My elder sister with her boyfriend live
My elder sister lives with her boyfriend.

3.5.2 No word order error was found in this category.

3.6 No word order error was found in this category.

4.1 49. E: 我从六点晚上到十点晚上在饭店工作。
Wo cong liu dian wanshang dao shi dian wanshang zai fandian gongzuo.
I from 6.00 pm to 10.00 pm at restaurant work
I work at a restaurant from 6.00 pm to 10.00 pm.

C: 我从晚上六点到十点在饭店工作。
Wo cong wanshang liu dian dao shi dian zai fandian gongzuo.
I from evening 6.00 pm to 10.00 pm at restaurant work
I work at a restaurant from 6.00 pm to 10.00 pm.

50. E: 我工作两个日[两天]一个星期。
Wo gongzuo liang tian yi ge xingqi.
I work two day one M week
I work two days a week.

C: 我一个星期工作两天。
Wo yi ge xingqi gongzuo liang tian.
I one M week work two day
I work two days a week.

4.2 51. E: 现在我住布里斯本澳大利亚。
Xian zai wo zhu bulisiben aodaliya.
Now I live Brisbane Australia
Now I live in Brisbane, Australia.

C: 现在我住澳大利亚布里斯本。
Xian zai wo zhu aodaliya bulisiben.
Now I live Australia Brisbane
Now I live in Brisbane, Australia.

4.3 No word order error was found in this category.

4.4 52. E: 我做完两个作业有三个。
Wo zuowan liang ge zuoye you san ge.
I do finish two M assignment have three M
I have finished two of my three assignments.

C: 我有三个作业, 做完两个了。
Wo you san ge zuoye, zuowan liang ge le.
I have three M assignment, do finish two M le
I have finished two of my three assignments.

5. No word order error was found in this category.

6. No word order error was found in this category.

7. 53. E: 一十二日四月二零零三年是我的生日。
Yi shi er ri si yue er ling ling san nian shi wo de shengri.
12 April 2003 is my birthday.
My birthday is on 12 April.

C: 我的生日是四月十二日。
Wo de shengri shi si yue shi er ri.
My birthday is April 12
My birthday is on 12 April.

8. No word order error was found in this category.

9. 54. E: 我妈妈和爸爸都工作中学老师。
Wo mama he baba dou gongzuo zhongxie laoshi.
I Mum and Dad all work high school teacher
My Mum and Dad both work as high school teachers.

C: 我爸爸和妈妈都在中学当老师。
Wo baba he mama dou zai zhongxue dang laoshi.
I Dad and Mum all at high school work teacher
My Mum and Dad both work as high school teachers.

55. E: 星期六晚上不好, 我去看我的妈妈爸爸。
Xingqi liu wanshang bu hao, wo qu kan wo de Mama Baba.
Saturday evening not good, I go see my Mum Dad
The Saturday evening is not good for me (because) I will go to see my Mum and Dad.

C: 星期六晚上不行, 我得去看我爸爸妈妈。
Xingqi liu wanshang bu xing, wo dei qu kan wo Baba Mama.
Saturday evening not good, I need go see my Dad Mum
The Saturday evening is not good for me (because) I will go to see my Mum and Dad.

56. E: 我家有四个人, 我妈妈爸爸姐姐和我。
Wo jia you si ge ren, wo Mama Baba jiejie he wo.
I family have four M people, I Mum Dad elder sister and I
There are four people in my family: my Mum, (my) Dad, (my) elder sister and me.

C: 我家有四个人, 我爸爸妈妈姐姐和我。
Wo jia you si ge ren, wo Baba Mama jiejie he wo.
I family have four M people, I Dad Mum elder sister and I
There are four people in my family: my Mum, (my) Dad, (my) elder sister and me.

10. Other 57. E: 我女朋友工作中学老师。
Wo nü pengyou gongzuo zhongxue laoshi.
I girlfriend work do high school teacher
My girlfriend works as a high school teacher.

C: 我女朋友做中学老师工作。
Wo nü pengyou dang zhongxue laoshi.
I girlfriend work high school teacher
My girlfriend works as a high school teacher.

58. E: 我们决定搬家一次。
Women jueding banjia yi ci.
We decide move home once
We have decided to move house for one time.

C: 我们决定搬一次家。
Women jueding ban yi ci jia.
We decide move once home
We have decided to move house for one time.

From level 2 learners (205 word order errors in total)

Category Word order errors and corresponding correct forms

1.1 59. E: 他问我:"谁你跟去北京?"
Ta wen wo: ''shei ni gen qu Beijing?''
He ask me: "who you with go Beijing?"
He asked me: "Whom are you going to go to Beijing with?"

C: 他问我:"你跟谁去北京?"
Ta wen wo: ''ni gen shei qu Beijing?''
He ask me: "you with who go Beijing?"
He asked me: "Whom are you going to go to Beijing with?"

1.2 60. E: 我男朋友有好的脾气。
Wo nan pengyou you hao de piqi.
I boyfriend have good temperament
My boyfriend has a good temperament.

C: 我男朋友脾气很好。
Wo nan pengyou piqi hen hao.
I boyfriend temperament very good
My boyfriend has a good temperament.

61. E: 我妈妈有不好的眼睛。
Wo mama you bu hao de yanjing.
I Mum have not good eye
My Mum's eyes are not good.

C: 我妈妈眼睛不好。
Wo mama yanjing bu hao.
I Mum eye not good
My Mum's eyes are not good.

62. E: 我还那本书了。
Wo huan naben shu le.
I return that M book LE
I have returned that book.

C: 那本书我还了。
Naben shu wo huan le.
That M book I return LE
I have returned that book.

63. E: 他丢他的钱包了。
Ta diu ta de qianbao le.
He lose his wallet LE
He lost his wallet.

C: 他的钱包丢了。
Ta de qianbao diu le.
His wallet lost LE
He lost his wallet.

64. E: 妹妹丢她的手表了。
Meimei diu ta de shoubiao le.
Younger sister lose her watch LE
(My) younger sister lost her watch.

C: 妹妹的手表丢了。
Meimei de shoubiao diu le.
Younger sister *de* watch lose LE
(My) younger sister lost her watch.

65. E: 我的爸爸说百闻不如一见长城。
Wo de baba shuo bai wen bu ru yi jian Changcheng.
My Dad say hundred times hear not as one see *Changcheng*
My Dad says that 'Seeing is believing' with the Great Wall.

C: 我爸爸说长城百闻不如一见。
Wo baba shuo Changcheng bai wen bu ru yi jian.
I Dad say Changcheng hundred times hear not as one see
My Dad says that 'Seeing is believing' with the Great Wall.

2.1 66. E: 我认识了大学几个新的朋友。
Wo renshi le daxue ji ge xin de pengyou.
I know LE university several new friend
I have made several new friends from the university.

C: 我认识了大学的几个新朋友。
Wo renshi le daxue de ji ge xin pengyou.
I know LE university *de* several new friend
I have made several new friends from the university.

67. E: 长城是我的最喜欢地方。
Changcheng shi wo de zui xihuan difang.
The Great Wall is I *de* favorite place.
The Great Wall is my favorite place.

C: 长城是我最喜欢的地方。
Changcheng shi wo zui xihuan de difang.
The Great Wall is I favorite place.
The Great Wall is my favorite place.

68. E: 那个菜是我的最喜欢菜。
Na ge cai shi wo de zui xihuan cai.
That dish is I *de* favorite dish
That dish is my favorite.

C: 那个菜是我最喜欢的菜。
Na ge cai shi wo de zui xihuan cai.
That dish is I *de* favorite dish
That dish is my favorite.

69. E: 她是我的最好朋友, 我们住在一块儿英国。
Ta shi wo de zui hao pengyou, women zhuzai yi kuair yingguo.
She is I *de* best friend, we stay together England
She is my best friend and we used to live together in England.

C: 她是我最好的朋友, 我们在英国时住一块儿。
Ta shi wo zuihao de pengyou, women zai yingguo shi zhu yi kuair.
She is I *de* best friend, we in England time stay together
She is my best friend and we used to live together in England.

70. E: 我邀请你来庆祝我新的家。
Wo yaoqing ni lai qingzhu wo xin de jia.
I invite you come celebrate I new home.
I invite you to come to celebrate my new home.

C: 我邀请你来庆祝我的新家。
Wo yaoqing ni lai qingzhu wo de xin jia.
I invite you come celebrate my new home.
I invite you to come to celebrate my new home.

71. E: 我想念中学全[体]的朋友。
Wo xiang nian zhongxue quanti de pengyou.
I miss high school all *de* friend
I miss all my friends in high school.

C: 我想念中学的全体朋友。
Wo xiang nian zhongxue de quanti pengyou.
I miss high school *de* all friend
I miss all my friends in high school.

2.2

72. E: 电影明天晚上的是六点半的。
Dianying mingtian wanshang de shi liu dian ban de.
Film tomorrow evening *de* is 6.30 pm
The film tomorrow evening is at 6.30 pm.

C: 明天晚上的电影是六点半的。
Mingtian wanshang de dianying shi liu dian ban de.
Tomorrow evening *de* film is 6:30 pm
The film tomorrow evening is at 6:30 pm.

73. E: 这几天我和朋友台湾的谈谈是多的[谈得很多]。
Zhe jitian wo he pengyou Taiwan de tan de henduo.
These several days I and friend Taiwan *de* talk *de* very many
I talked a lot with the friend from Taiwan in the past several days.

C: 这几天我和台湾的朋友谈得很多。
Zhe jitian wo he Taiwan de pengyou tan de henduo.
These several days I and Taiwan *de* friend talk *de* very many
I talked a lot with the friend from Taiwan in the past several days.

74. E: 这是个真好的机会学中文。
Zhe shi ge zhen hao de jihui xue zhongwen.
This is M real good opportunity learn Chinese
This is a really good opportunity to learn Chinese.

C: 这真是个学中文的好机会。
Zhe zhen shi ge xue zhongwen de hao jihui.
This really is M learn Chinese *de* good opportunity
This is a really good opportunity to learn Chinese.

75. E: 我想买电影票六点。
Wo xiang mai dianying piao liu dian.
I want buy film ticket 6 o'clock
I would like to buy a film ticket for the 6 o'clock show.

C: 我想买六点的电影票。
Wo xiang mai liu dian de dianying piao.
I want buy 6 o'clock *de* film ticket
I would like to buy a film ticket for the 6 o'clock show.

76. E: 我没有时间吃饭和睡眠的。
Wo meiyou shijian chifan he shuimian de.
I not have time eat and sleep *de*
I do not have any time to eat and sleep.

C: 我没有吃饭和睡眠的时间。
Wo meiyou chifan he shuimian de shijian.
I not have eat and sleep *de* time
I do not have any time to eat and sleep.

77. E: 今天是我的最后一天在新加坡。
Jintian shi wo de zuihou yitian zai Xinjiapo.
Today is my last one day in Singapore
Today is my last day in Singapore.

C: 今天是我在新加坡的最后一天。
Jintian shi wo zai Xinjiapo de zuihou yitian.
Today is I in Singapore *de* last one day
Today is my last day in Singapore.

78. E: 这个星期我给我的中文班说话[讲]关于我的时间在中国。
Zhe ge xingqi wo gei wo de Zhongwen ban jiang guanyu wo de shijian zai zhongguo.
This week I for my Chinese class talk regarding my time in China
This week I'm talking about my time in China to my Chinese class.

C: 这个星期我给我的中文班讲关于我在中国的日子。
Zhe ge xingqi wo gei wo de Zhongwen ban jiang guanyu wo zai zhongguo de rizi.
This week I for my Chinese class talk regarding in China
my time
This week I'm talking about my time in China to my
Chinese class.

79. E: 我们去一个聚会在 Hilton。
Women qu yi ge juhui zai Hilton.
We go a gathering at Hilton
We are going to a gathering at the Hilton.

C: 我们去一个在 Hilton 的聚会。
Women qu yi ge zai Hilton de juhui.
We go a gathering at Hilton
We are going to a gathering at the Hilton.

80. E: 游览北京真是一个好体验人生的。
You lan Beijing zhen shi yi ge hao ti yan ren sheng de.
Traveling Beijing really is one M experience life *de*
Traveling to Beijing is really a good experience in life.

C: 游览北京真是一个人生的好体验。
You lan Beijing zhen shi yi ge ren sheng de hao ti yan.
Traveling Beijing really is one M life *de* experience
Traveling to Beijing is really a good experience in life.

81. E: 一起出去吃饭是好机会与朋友见面。
Yiqi chu qu chifan shi hao jihui yu pengyou jianmian.
Together qu eat dinner is good opportunity and friend see
Going out and having dinner together is a good opportunity
to see friends.

C: 一起出去吃饭是与朋友见面的好机会。
Yiqi chu qu chifan shi yu pengyou jianmian de hao jihui.
Together go out eat dinner is and friend see good opportunity
Going out and having dinner together is a good opportunity to see friends.

82. E: 我用中文在饭店我上班。
Wo yong Zhongwen zai fandian wo shangban.
I use Chinese at restaurant I work
I use Chinese at the restaurant where I work.

C: 我在我上班的饭店用中文。
Wo zai wo shangban de fandian yong Zhongwen.
I at restaurant I work use Chinese
I use Chinese at the restaurant where I work.

3.1.1 83. E: 从你家向南走一直沿中山路。
Cong ni jia xiang nan zou yizhi yan Zhongshan lu.
From your home towards south walk straight along Zhongshan Road
Walk south along Zhongshan Road from your home.

C: 从你家沿中山路向南一直走。
Cong ni jia yan Zhongshan lu yizhi xiang nan zou.
From your home along Zhongshan Road towards south straight walk
Walk south along Zhongshan Road from your home.

84. E: 我上个周末去聚会学院了。
Wo shang ge zhoumo qu juhui xue yuan le.
I last weekend go get together college LE
I went to the college to have a party last weekend.

C: 我上个周末去学院聚会了。
Wo shang ge zhoumo qu xue yuan juhui le.
I last weekend go college have party LE
I went to the college to have a party last weekend.

85. E: 完吃饭以后, 我们在中国城游览。
Wan chifan yihou, women zai Zhongguocheng youlan.
Finish eat after, we at Chinatown sight seeing.
After finishing dinner, we went sightseeing at Chinatown.

C: 吃完饭以后, 我们在中国城游览。
Chi wan fan yihou, women zai Zhongguocheng youlan.
Eat finish after, we at Chinatown sight seeing.
After finishing dinner, we went sightseeing at Chinatown.

86. E: (今天早上我回到澳大利亚), 我很高兴看我的家在机场。
Wo hen gaoxing kan wo de jia zai jichang.
I very happy see my family at airport.
I am very happy to see my family at the airport.

C: (今天早上我回到澳大利亚), 在机场看见我的家人我很高兴。
Zai jichang kanjian wo de jiaren wo hen gaoxing.
At airport see my family I very happy.
I am very happy to see my family at the airport.

87. E: 我跑我的房间到, 找作业到, 交上作业了。
Wo pao wo de fangjian dao, zhao zuoye dao, jiao shang zuo ye le.
I run my room, find assignment, hand in assignment LE
I ran to my room, found my assignment and handed it in.

C: 我跑到我的房间, 找到作业, 交上作业了。
Wo pao wo de fangjian dao, zhao zuoye dao, jiao shang zuo ye le.
I run my room, find assignment, hand in assignment LE
I ran to my room, found my assignment and handed it in.

88. E: 我去工作台湾。
Wo qu gongzuo Taiwan.
I go work Taiwan
I'll go to work in Taiwan.

C: 我去台湾工作。
Wo qu Taiwan gongzuo.
I go Taiwan work
I'll go to work in Taiwan.

89. E: 星期六我去游泳了海滩。
Xingqiliu wo qu youyong le haitan.
Saturday I go swim LE beach
I went to the beach to swim on Saturday.

C: 星期六我去海滩游泳了。
Xingqiliu wo qu haitan youyong le.
Saturday I go beach swim LE
I went to the beach to swim on Saturday.

3.1.2 90. E: 我的新地址不远从[离]大学。
Wo de xin dizhi bu yuan li daxue.
My new address not far from university
My new address is not far from the university.

C: 我的新地址离大学不远。
Wo de xin dizhi li daxue bu yuan.
My new address from university not far
My new address is not far from the university.

91. E: 你要先上十五号公路, 然后第三个出口拐左。
Ni yao xian shang 15 hao gonglu, ranhou di sange chukou guai zuo.
You want first up Highway No. 15, then the third exit turn left
First you go to Highway No. 15, then turn left at the third exit.

C: 你要先上十五号公路, 然后第三个出口左拐。
Ni yao xian shang 15 hao gonglu, ranhou di sange chukou zuo guai.
You want first up Highway No. 15, then the third exit left turn
First you go to Highway No. 15, then turn left at the third exit.

92. E: 然后从右边的第四条街拐右就到了。
Ranhou cong you bian de di si tiao jie guai you jiu dao le.
Then from right *de* the fourth street turn right arrive LE
Turn right from the fourth street on the right side, then you'll be there.

C: 然后从右边的第四条街右拐就到了。
Ranhou cong you bian de di si tiao jie you guai jiu dao le.
Then from right *de* the fourth street right turn arrive LE
Turn right from the fourth street on the right side, then you'll be there.

93. E: 你向前走到十字路口拐左。
Ni xiang qian zou dao shizi lukou guai zuo.
You towards front walk to intersection turn left
Walk ahead to an intersection and turn left.

C: 你向前走到十字路口左拐。
Ni xiang qian zou dao shizi lukou zuo guai.
You towards front walk to intersection left turn
Walk ahead to an intersection and turn left.

94. E: 我们整天都留在饭店没有出外。
Women zhengtian liu zai fandian mei you chu wai.
We whole day all stay at hotel not have go out
We stayed in the hotel the whole day without going out.

C: 我们整天都留在饭店没有外出。
Women zhengtian liu zai fandian mei you wai chu.
We whole day all stay at hotel not have out go
We stayed in the hotel the whole day without going out.

95. E: 我很高兴因为我相遇他们。
Wo hen gaoxing yinwen wo xiangyu tamen.
I very happy because I meet them
I am very happy because I have met them.

C: 我很高兴因为我和他们相遇。
Wo hen gaoxing yinwen wo he tamen xiangyu.
I very happy because I and them meet
I am very happy because I have met them.

96. E: 我听说我获胜了一个比赛会。
Wo ting shuo wo huosheng le yi ge bisaihui.
I hear say I win LE one M competition
I heard that I had won the competition.

C: 我听说我在比赛会上获胜了。
Wo ting shuo wo zai bisaihui shang huosheng le.
I hear say I at competition win LE
I heard that I had won the competition.

97. E: 现在我得走了, 明天我在(再)写多。
Xianzai wo dei zou le, mingtian wo zai xie duo.
Now I have to go, tomorrow I again write more
Now I have to go and I will write more tomorrow.

C: 现在我得走了, 明天我再多写。
Xianzai wo dei zou le, mingtian wo zai duo xie.
Now I have to go, tomorrow I again more write
Now I have to go and I will write more tomorrow.

98. E: 到我的家从飞机场开车一个小时。
Dao wo de jia cong feijichang kai che yi ge xiaoshi.
To my home from airport drive one M hour
It takes an hour's drive from my home to the airport.

C: 从飞机场到我的家开车一个小时。
Cong feijichang dao wo de jia kai che yi ge xiaoshi.
From airport to my home drive one M hour
It takes an hour's drive from my home to the airport.

99. E: 我毕业从大学以后想去中国。
Wo biye cong daxue yihou xiang qu Zhongguo.
I graduate from university after want to go China
I would like to go to China after graduation from university.

C: 我从大学毕业以后想去中国。
Wo cong daxue biye yihou xiang qu Zhongguo.
I from university graduate after want to go China
I would like to go to China after graduation from university.

100. E: (今天我父母打算请我伯伯和他们家吃晚饭,)
我家七点半相遇他们在里面饭馆。
Wo jia qi dian ban xiang yu tamen zai limian de fanguan.
My family 7.30 meet them at inside restaurant
My family is going to meet them inside the restaurant.

C: 我家七点半在饭馆里面和他们见面。
Wo jia qi dian ban zai fanguan limian he tamen jianmian.
My family 7.30 at restaurant inside meet them
My family is going to meet them inside the restaurant.

101. E: 我和他承诺[约好]遇见互相在中国。
Wo he ta chengnuo yujian xiang hu zai Zhongguo.
I and he promise meet each other in China
He and I promised to meet each other in China.

C: 我和他约好在中国相见。
Wo he ta xunuo zai Zhongguo xiang jian.
I and he promise in China meet each other
He and I promised to meet each other in China.

3.1.3 102. E: (比赛完了以后大伟跟一些英国朋友出去吃饭)
我回去饭店了。
Wo hui qu fandian le.
I back go restaurant LE
I went back to the restaurant.

C: 我回饭店去了。
Wo hui fandian qu le.
I back restaurant go LE
I went back to the restaurant.

103. E: 明天我们要回去汉城。
Mingtian women yao hui qu Hancheng.
Tomorrow we want back go Seoul
We will go back to Seoul tomorrow.

C: 明天我们要回汉城去。
Mingtian women yao hui Hancheng qu.
Tomorrow we want back Seoul go
We will go back to Seoul tomorrow.

104. E: 明天我要回去布里斯班。
Mingtian wo yao hui qu Bulisiban.
Tomorrow I want to back go Brisbane
I will go back to Brisbane tomorrow.

C: 明天我要回布里斯班去。
Mingtian wo yao hui Bulisiban qu.
Tomorrow I want to back Brisbane go
I will go back to Brisbane tomorrow.

105. E: 明天我们打算回去澳大利亚。
Mingtian women dasuan hui qu Aodaliya.
Tomorrow we plan back go Australia
We are planning to go back to Australia tomorrow.

C: 明天我们打算回澳大利亚去。
Mingtian women dasuan hui Aodaliya qu.
Tomorrow we plan back Australia go
We are planning to go back to Australia tomorrow.

106. E: 我朋友上个星期刚回来澳大利亚。
Wo pengyou shang ge xingqi hui lai Aodaliya
My friend last week back come Australia
My friend came back to Australia last week.

C: 我朋友上个星期刚回澳大利亚来。
Wo pengyou shang ge xingqi hui Aodaliya lai
My friend last week back Australia come
My friend came back to Australia last week.

107. E: 吃完饭, 我没钱去看电影, 所以我就回来家。
Chi wan fan, wo mei qian kan dianying, suoyi wo jiu hui lai jia.
Eat finish meal, I not qian see film, so I then back come home
After the meal, I had no money to see a film, so I came back home.

C: 吃完饭, 我没钱去看电影, 所以我就回家来。
Chi wan fan, wo mei qian kan dianying, suoyi wo jiu hui jia lai.
Eat finish meal, I not qian see film, so I then back home come
After the meal, I had no money to see a film, so I came back home.

108. E: 我们刚从饭馆回来北京饭店。
Women gang cong fanguan hui lai Beijing fandian.
We just from restaurant back come Beijing Hotel
We have just come back to the Beijing Hotel from a restaurant.

C: 我们刚从饭馆回北京饭店来。
Women gang cong fanguan hui Beijing fandian lai.
We just from restaurant back Beijing Hotel come
We have just come back to the Beijing Hotel from a restaurant.

109. E: 我希望我能帮忙他们。
Wo xiwang wo neng bangmang tamen.
I hope I can help them
I hope I can help them.

C: 我希望我能帮他们的忙。
Wo xiwang wo neng bang tamen de mang.
I hope I can help them
I hope I can help them.

3.1.4 110. E: 第三天我们去了爬万里长城。
Di san tian women qu le pa Wanlichangcheng.
The third day we go LE climb the Great Wall
We went to climb the Great Wall on the third day.

C1: 第三天我们去爬了万里长城。
Di san tian women qu pa le Wanlichangcheng.
The third day we go climb LE the Great Wall
We went to climb the Great Wall on the third day.

C2: 第三天我们去爬万里长城了。
Di san tian women qu pa Wanlichangcheng le.
The third day we go climb the Great Wall LE.
We went to climb the Great Wall on the third day.

111. E: 这几天去了看很多东西。
Zhe jitian qu le kan hen duo dongxi.
This several days go LE see very many thing
(We) went to see many things this couple of days.

C: 这几天去看了很多东西。
Zhe jitian qu kan le hen duo dongxi.
This several days go see LE very many thing
(We) went to see many things this couple of days.

112. E: 回到汉城的家以后, 我们去了看望老朋友。
Hui dao Hancheng de jia yihou, wome qu le kan wang lao pengyou.
Return Seoul home after, we go LE see old friend
After returning to our home in Seoul, we went to see our old friends.

C1: 回到汉城的家以后, 我们去看望了老朋友。
Hui dao Hancheng de jia yihou, wome qu kan wang le lao pengyou.
Return Seoul home after, we go see LE old friend
After returning to our home in Seoul, we went to see our old friends.

C2: 回到汉城的家以后, 我们去看望老朋友了。
Hui dao Hancheng de jia yihou, wome qu kan wang lao pengyou le.
Return Seoul home after, we go see old friend LE
After returning to our home in Seoul, we went to see our old friends.

113. E: 我和我的朋友都爬了上长城。
Wo he wo de pengyou dou pa le shang Changcheng.
I and my friend all climb LE up the Great Wall
My friend and I both climbed onto the Great Wall.

C1: 我和我的朋友都爬上了长城。
Wo he wo de pengyou dou pa le shang Changcheng.
I and my friend all climb LE up the Great Wall
My friend and I both climbed onto the Great Wall.

C2: 我和我的朋友都爬上长城了。
Wo he wo de pengyou dou pa shang Changcheng le.
I and my friend all climb up the Great Wall LE
My friend and I both climbed onto the Great Wall.

114. E: 上个星期我去了看我妈妈爸爸。
Shang ge xingqi wo qu le kan wo mama baba.
Last week I go LE see I Mum Dad
I went to see my Mum and Dad last week.

C1: 上个星期我去看了我爸爸妈妈。
Shang ge xingqi wo qu kan le wo baba mama.
Last week I go see LE I Dad Mum
I went to see my Mum and Dad last week.

C2: 上个星期我去看我爸爸妈妈了。
Shang ge xingqi wo qu kan wo baba mama le.
Last week I go see I Dad Mum LE
I went to see my Mum and Dad last week.

3.2.1 115. E: 我们一起吃午饭在北京饭店。
Women yiqi chi wufan zai Beijing Fandian.
We together eat lunch at Beijing Hotel
We had lunch together at the Beijing Hotel.

C: 我们在北京饭店一起吃午饭。
Women zai Beijing Fandian yiqi chi wufan.
We at Beijing Hotel together eat lunch
We had lunch together at the Beijing Hotel.

116. E: 我们也买东西在友谊商店。
Women ye mai dongxi zai youyi shangdian.
We also buy thing at the Friendship Shop
We also did shopping at the Friendship Shop.

C: 我们也在友谊商店买东西。
Women ye zai youyi shangdian mai dongxi.
We also at the Friendship Shop buy thing
We also did shopping at the Friendship Shop.

117. E: 我和一个朋友去吃饭在西安。
Wo he yi ge pengyou qu chifan zai Xi'an.
I and a friend go eat meal at Xi'an
A friend of mine and I went to have dinner in Xi'an.

C: 在西安我和一个朋友去吃饭。
Zai Xi'an wo he yi ge pengyou qu chifan.
At Xi'an I and a friend go eat meal
A friend of mine and I went to have dinner in Xi'an.

118. E: 我也看望我的老朋友在北京。
Wo ye kanwang wo de lao pengyou zai Beijing.
I also visit my old friend in Beijing
In Beijing I also visited my old friends.

C: 在北京我也看望了我的老朋友。
Zai Beijing wo ye kanwang le wo de lao pengyou.
In Beijing I also visit LE my old friend
In Beijing I also visited my old friends.

119. E: 我正在旅行北京。
Wo zhengzai lüxing Beijing.
I Asp travel Beijing
I am traveling around in Beijing.

C: 我正在北京旅行。
Wo zhengzai Beijing lüxing.
I Asp Beijing travel
I am traveling around in Beijing.

120. E: 因此我做烤鸭吃在聚会上。
Yinci wo zuo kaoya chi zai juhui shang.
Therefore I cook roasted duck at the party.
Therefore, I will cook roast duck for the party.

C: 因此在聚会上我做烤鸭吃。
Yinci zai juhui shang wo zuo kaoya chi.
Therefore at the party I cook roasted duck.
Therefore, I will cook roast duck for the party.

121. E: 向右拐在北京路。
Xiang you guai zai Beijing Lu.
Turn right at Beijing Road
Turn right at Beijing Road.

C: 在北京路向右拐。
Zai Beijing Lu xiang you guai.
Turn right at Beijing Road
Turn right at Beijing Road.

122. E: 我和他见面在日本。
Wo he ta jianmian zai Riben.
I and he meet in Japan
He and I will meet (each other) in Japan.

C: 我和他在日本见面。
Wo he ta zai Riben jianmian.
I and he in Japan meet
He and I will meet (each other) in Japan.

123. E: 我和他承诺[约好]遇见互相在中国。
Wo he ta yuehao yujian xiang hu zai Zhongguo.
I and he promise meet each other in China
He and I promised to meet each other in China.

C: 我和他约好在中国相见。
Wo he ta yuehao zai Zhongguo xiangjian.
I and he promise in China meet each other
He and I promised to meet each other in China.

124. E: 小马是很有名在济州岛。
Xiao ma shi hen you ming zai Jizhoudao.
Pony is very well known on Jizhou Island
Ponies are very well known on Jizhou Island.

C: 小马在济州岛很有名。
Xiao ma zai Jizhoudao hen you ming.
Pony at Jizhou Island very well known
Ponies are very well known on Jizhou Island.

125. E: 我们都很高兴在济州岛。
Women dou hen gaoxing zai Jizhou Island.
We all very happy on Jizhou Island
We were all very happy on Jizhou Island.

C: 在济州岛我们都很高兴。
Zai Jizhou Island women dou hen gaoxing.
On Jizhou Island we all very happy
We were all very happy on Jizhou Island.

126. E: (后年我要去中国练习我的中文)因为我要工作在北京。
Yinwei wo yao gongzuo zai Beijing.
Because I want work in Beijing
Because I want to work in Beijing.

C: 因为我要在北京工作。
Yinwei wo yao zai Beijing gongzuo.
Because I want in Beijing work
Because I want to work in Beijing.

127. E: 他开始学中文在大学。
Ta kaishi xue Zhongwen zai daxue.
He begin learn Chinese at university
He began learning Chinese at university.

C: 他在大学开始学中文。
Ta zai daxue kaishi xue Zhongwen.
He at university begin learn Chinese
He began learning Chinese at university.

128. E: 我说[告诉]他们我有很好时间在中国。
Wo gaosu tamen wo you hen hao shijian zai Zhongguo.
I tell them I have good time in China
I told them that I had a good time in China.

C: 我告诉他们我在中国玩得很开心。
Wo gaosu tamen wo zai Zhongguo wan de hen kaixin.
I tell them I in China have good time
I told them that I had a good time in China.

129. E: 我买了纪念品在中国。
Wo mai le jinianpin zai Zhongguo.
I buy LE souvenir in China
I bought some souvenirs in China.

C: 我在中国买了纪念品。
Wo zai Zhongguo mai le jinianpin.
I in China buy LE souvenir
I bought some souvenirs in China.

130. E: 星期一我们吃饭中国城。
Xingqi yi women chi fan Zhongguocheng.
Monday we eat meal Chinatown
We had a meal at Chinatown on Monday.

C: 星期一我们在中国城吃饭。
Xingqi yi women zai Zhongguocheng chi fan.
Monday we at Chinatown eat meal
We had a meal at Chinatown on Monday.

131. E: 我用中文在饭店我上班。
Wo yong Zhongwen zai fandian wo shang ban.
I use Chinese at restaurant I work
I use Chinese at the restaurant where I work.

C: 我在我上班的饭店用中文。
Wo zai wo shang ban de fandian yong Zhongwen.
I at I work restaurant use Chinese
I use Chinese at the restaurant where I work.

132. E: 我喜欢几个星期游览在一个国家。
Wo xihuan ji ge xingqi youlan zai yi ge guojia.
I like several week travel at one country
I like to travel for several weeks in one country.

C: 我喜欢在一个国家游览几个星期。
Wo xihuan zai yi ge guojia youlan ji ge xingqi.
I like at one country travel several week
I like to travel for several weeks in one country.

3.2.2 133. E: 向左拐西安路到。
Xiang zuo guai Xi'an Lu dao.
Towards left turn Xi'an Road arrive
Turn left, (you'll) get to Xi'an Road.

C: 向左拐到西安路。
Xiang zuo guai dao Xi'an Lu.
Towards left turn arrive Xi'an Road
Turn left, (you'll) get to Xi'an Road.

134. E: 昨天我们在英国到达了。
Zuotian women zai Yingguo dao da le.
Yesterday we in England arrive LE
We arrived in England yesterday.

C: 昨天我们到达英国了。
Zuotian women dao da Yingguo le.
Yesterday we arrive England LE
We arrived in England yesterday.

135. E: 这个星期在我的家我的中国朋友呆了。
Zhe ge xingqi zai wo de jia wo de Zhongguo pengyou dai le.
This week at my home my Chinese friend stay LE
My Chinese friend has stayed in my home this week.

C: 这个星期我的中国朋友呆在我的家了。
Zhe ge xingqi wo de Zhongguo pengyou dai zai wo de jia le.
This week my Chinese friend stay at my home LE
My Chinese friend has stayed in my home this week.

136. E: 我希望在城市附近我的家。
Wo xiwang zai chengshi fujin wo de jia.
I hope at city nearby my home
I wish my home were near the city.

C: 我希望我的家在城市附近。
Wo xiwang wo de jia zai chengshi fujin.
I hope my home at city nearby
I wish my home were near the city.

137. E: 晚饭以后, 悉尼港口我们逛了一下儿。
Wanfan yihou, Xini gangkou wome guang le yi xiar.
Dinner after, Sydney port we stroll a bit
After dinner, we strolled a bit at Sydney port.

C: 晚饭以后, 我们逛了一下儿悉尼港口。
Wanfan yihou, wome guang le yi xiar Xini gangkou.
Dinner after, we stroll a bit Sydney port
After dinner, we strolled a bit at Sydney port.

138. E: 我喝醉了, 就在马路边睡了。
Wo he zui le, jiu zai malu bian shui le.
I drink drunk LE, then at street sleep LE
I was drunk and then slept on the street.

C: 我喝醉了, 就睡在马路边了。
Wo he zui le, jiu shui zai malu bian le.
I drink drunk LE, then sleep at street LE
I was drunk and then slept on the street.

3.3.1 139. E: 我请你来我的新家下个月。
Wo qing ni lai wo de xin jia xia ge yue.
I invite you come my new home next month
I will invite you to come to my new home next month.

C: 下个月我请你来我的新家。
Xia ge yue wo qing ni lai wo de xin jia.
Next month I invite you come my new home
I will invite you to come to my new home next month.

140. E: 你可以到我家六点半。
Ni keyi dao wo jia liu dian ban.
You can arrive my home 6.30
You can come to my home at 6.30.

C: 你可以六点半到我家。
Ni keyi liu dian ban dao wo jia.
You can 6.30 arrive my home
You can come to my home at 6.30.

141. E: 晚饭开始半个小时以后。
Wanfan kaishi ban xiaoshi yihou.
Dinner start half an hour later
Dinner will be served half an hour later.

C: 晚饭半个小时以后开始。
Wanfan ban xiaoshi yihou kaishi.
Dinner half an hour later start
Dinner will be served half an hour later.

142. E: 晚会开始在六点四十。
Wanhui kaishi zai liu dian sishi.
Party start at 6.40 pm
The party will start at 6.40 pm.

C: 晚会在六点四十开始。
Wanhui zai liu dian sishi kaishi.
Party at 6.40 pm start
The party will start at 6.40 pm.

143. E: 我要搬家两周以后。
Wo yao banjia liang zhou yihou.
I want move two week later
I am going to move two weeks later.

C: 我两周以后要搬家。
Wo liang zhou yihou yao banjia.
I two week later want move
I am going to move two weeks later.

144. E: 正餐开始七点半。
Zhengcan kaishi qi dian ban.
Dinner start 7.30
Dinner will start at 7.30.

C: 正餐七点半开始。
Zhengcan qi dian ban kaishi.
Dinner 7.30 start
Dinner will start at 7.30.

145. E: 我刚到北京昨天的晚上。
Wo gang dao Beijing zuotian de wanshang.
I just arrive Beijing yesterday evening
I just arrived in Beijing yesterday evening.

C: 我昨天晚上刚到北京。
Wo zuotian wanshang gang dao Beijing.
I yesterday evening just arrive Beijing
I just arrived in Beijing yesterday evening.

146. E: 我回去澳大利亚下星期六。
Wo hui qu Aodaliya xia xingqi liu.
I back go Australia next Saturday
I will go back to Australia next Saturday.

C: 我下星期六回澳大利亚去。
Wo xia xingqi liu hui Aodaliya qu.
I next Saturday back Australia go
I will go back to Australia next Saturday.

147. E: 我每天醒来在七点。
Wo meitian xing lai zai qi dian.
I every day woke up at 7.00 am
I woke up at 7.00 am every day.

C: 我每天在七点醒来。
Wo meitian zai qi dian xing lai.
I every day at 7.00 am woke up
I woke up at 7.00 am every day.

148. E: 我想看望你上[下个]月二十七, 好不好?
Wo xiang kanwang ni xia ge yue ershiqi, hao bu hao?
I want visit you next month 27, good not good?
I would like to visit you on 27th next month, is that ok?

C: 我想下个月二十七去看望你, 好不好?
Wo xiang xia ge yue ershiqi qu kanwang ni, hao bu hao?
I want next month 27 to visit you, good not good?
I would like to visit you on 27th next month, is that ok?

149. E: 我到北京晚上七点。
Wo dao Beijing wanshang qi dian.
I arrive Beijing evening 7.00
I will arrive in Beijing at 7.00 in the evening.

C: 我晚上七点到北京。
Wo wanshang qi dian dao Beijing.
I evening 7.00 arrive Beijing
I will arrive in Beijing at 7.00 in the evening.

150. E: 我旅行了从二月二日到三月三日。
Wo lüxing le cong er yue er ri dao san yue san ri.
I travel LE from February 2 to March 3
I went traveling from 2nd February to 3rd March.

C: 从二月二日到三月三日我去旅行了。
Cong er yue er ri dao san yue san ri wo qu lüxing le.
From February 2 to March 3 I to travel LE
I went traveling from 2nd February to 3rd March.

151. E: 我的航班离开了在五点早上。
Wo de hangban likai le zai 5.00 zaoshang.
My flight leave LE at 5.00 morning
My flight departed at 5.00 in the morning.

C: 我的航班在早上五点离开了。
Wo de hangban zai zaoshang wu dian likai le.
My flight at morning 5.00 leave LE
My flight departed at 5.00 in the morning.

152. E: 请到我的家在六点。
Qing dao wo de jia zai liu dian.
Please arrive my home at six
Please come to my home at six.

C: 请在六点到我的家。
Qing zai liu dia dao wo de jian.
Please at six arrive my home
Please come to my home at six.

153. E: 所以我们开始吃饭在七点。
Suoyi women kaishi chi fan zai qi dian.
Therefore we start eat meal at seven
Therefore, we start dinner at seven.

C: 所以我们在七点开始吃饭。
Suoyi women zai qi dian kaishi chi fan.
Therefore we at seven start eat meal
Therefore, we start dinner at seven.

154. E: 我们有一顿正餐七点半。
Women you yi dun zhengcan qi dian ban.
We have one M dinner seven thirty
We will have dinner at seven thirty.

C: 我们七点半有一顿正餐。
Women qi dian ban you yi dun zhengcan.
We seven thirty have one M dinner
We will have dinner at seven thirty.

155. E: 我打算返回日本在七月。
Wo dasuan fanhui Riben zai qi yue.
I plan return Japan in July
I plan to return to Japan in July.

C: 我打算在七月返回日本。
Wo dasuan zai qi yue fanhui Riben.
I plan in July return Japan
I plan to return to Japan in July.

156. E: 我想去上海明天早晨。
Wo xiang qu Shanghai mingtian zaoshang.
I want to Shanghai tomorrow morning
I am going to Shanghai tomorrow morning.

C: 我想明天早晨去上海。
Wo xiang mingtian zaoshang qu Shanghai.
I tomorrow morning go Shanghai
I am going to Shanghai tomorrow morning.

157. E: 每天我起床八点。
Meitian wo qichuang ba dian.
Every day I get up eight
I get up at eight every day.

C: 我每天八点起床。
Wo meitian ba dian qichuang.
I every day eight get up
I get up at eight every day.

158. E: 很难起床三点半。
Hen nan qichuang san dian ban.
Very difficult get up three thirty
It is very difficult to get up at three thirty.

C: 三点半起床很难。
San dian ban qichuang hen nan.
Three thirty get up very difficult
It is very difficult to get up at three thirty.

159. E: 我有考试四月十四日。
Wo you kaoshi si yue shi si ri.
I have exam April 14
I have an exam on 14th April.

C: 我四月十四日有考试。
Wo si yue shi si ri you kaoshi.
I April 14 have exam
I have an exam on 14th April.

160. E: 我周末聚会从七点到十二点
(我下个上午[第二天上午]很累)。
Wo zhoumo juhui cong qi dian dao shi er dian.
I weekend have party from seven to twelve
I had a party from seven to twelve on Sunday.

C: 我周末从七点到十二点聚会。
Wo zhoumo cong qi dian dao shi er dian juhui.
I weekend from seven to twelve have party
I had a party from seven to twelve on Sunday.

161. E: 我们看电影明天晚上六点半。
Women kan dianying mingtian wanshang liu dian ban.
We see film tomorrow evening six thirty
We are going to see a film at six thirty tomorrow evening.

C: 我们明天晚上六点半看电影。
Women mingtian wanshang liu dian ban kan dianying.
We tomorrow evening six thirty see film
We are going to see a film at six thirty tomorrow evening.

3.3.2 162. E: 我已经三天来北京了。
Wo yijing santian lai Beijing le.
I already three days come Beijing LE.
It has been three days since I came to Beijing.

C: 我已经来北京三天了。
Wo yijing lai Beijing santian le.
I already come Beijing three days LE.
It has been three days since I came to Beijing.

163. E: 我们有三天在北京旅游。
Women you santian zai Beijing lüyou.
We have three days at Bejing travel
We have traveled three days in Beijing.

C: 我们在北京旅游三天。
Women zai Beijing lüyou santian.
We at Bejing travel three days
We have traveled three days in Beijing.

164. E: 一个星期我们只迁入。
Yi ge xingqi women zhi qianru.
One week we only move in
It has been only a week since we moved in.

C: 我们迁入只一个星期。
Yi ge qianru zhi xingqi women.
We move in only one week
It has been only a week since we moved in.

165. E: 很多小时我学习汉语。
Henduo xiaoshi wo xuexi hanyu.
Many hours I study Chinese
I have studied Chinese for many hours.

C: 我学习汉语很多小时。
Wo xuexi hanyu henduo xiaoshi.
I study Chinese many hours
I have studied Chinese for many hours.

166. E: 三天我在一个船上住。
Santian wo zai yige chuan shang zhu.
Three days I at one cruise on stay
I stayed on a cruise for three days.

C: 我在一个船上住三天。
Wo zai yige chuan shang zhu santian.
I at one cruise on stay three days
I stayed on a cruise for three days.

167. E: 我和我的家一起一个假期渡过了。
Wo he wo de jia yiqi yige jiaqi du guo le.
I and my family together one vacation spend LE.
I have spent the whole vacation together with my family.

C: 我和我家一起渡过了一个假期。
Wo he wo de jia yiqi du guo le yige jiaqi.
I and my family together spend LE one vacation.
I have spent the whole vacation together with my family.

168. E: 我们十分钟能骑小马。
Women shi fenzhong neng qi xiao ma.
We ten minutes can ride pony
We can ride a pony for ten minutes.

C: 我们能骑小马十分钟。
Women neng qi xiao ma shi fenzhong.
We can ride pony ten minutes
We can ride a pony for ten minutes.

169. E: 她住悉尼, 我跟她两个星期一起住。
Ta zhu Xini, wo gen ta liang ge xingqi yiqi zhu.
She live Sydney, I and her two weeks together stay
She lives in Sydney and I'll stay with her for a week.

C: 她住悉尼, 我跟她一起住两个星期。
Ta zhu Xini, wo gen ta yiqi zhu liang ge xingqi.
She live Sydney, I and her together stay two weeks
She lives in Sydney and I'll stay with her for a week.

170. E: 我二十分要等因为我的飞机一点儿慢[晚]。
Wo ershi fen yao deng yinwei wo de feiji wan le yidianr.
I twenty minutes want wait because my plane a bit slow
I had to wait for twenty minutes because my flight was delayed a bit.

C: 我要等二十分因为我的飞机晚了一点儿。
Wo yao deng ershi fen yinwei wo de feiji wan le yidianr.
I want wait twenty minutes because my plane late a bit
I had to wait for twenty minutes because my flight was delayed a bit.

171. E: 我九月要去台湾一年学中文。
Wo jiuyue yao qu Taiwan yinian xue zhongwen.
I September want go Taiwan one year study Chinese
I'll go to Taiwan in September to study Chinese for a year.

C: 我九月要去台湾学一年中文。
Wo jiuyue yao qu Taiwan xue yinian zhongwen.
I September want go Taiwan study one year Chinese
I'll go to Taiwan in September to study Chinese for a year.

172. E: 我和哥哥一天打了高尔夫球。
Wo he gege yitian da le gaoerfuqiu.
I and elder brother one day play LE golf
My elder brother and I have spent the whole day playing golf.

C: 我和哥哥打了一天高尔夫球。
Wo he gege da le yitian gaoerfuqiu.
I and elder brother play LE one day golf
I and my elder brother have played golf for a whole day.
My elder brother and I have spent the whole day playing golf.

173. E: 要五分钟走才到。
Yao wu fenzhng zou cai dao.
Want five minutes walk arrive
It takes five minutes to walk there.

C: 要走五分钟才到。
Yao zou wu fenzhng cai dao.
Want walk five minutes arrive
It takes five minutes to walk there.

174. E: 离这儿十五分钟走路。
Li zher shiwu fenzhong zou lu.
From here fifteen minutes walk
It takes fifteen minutes to walk from here.

C: 离这儿走路十五分钟。
Li zher zou lu shiwu fenzhong.
From here walk fifteen minutes
It takes fifteen minutes to walk from here.

175. E: 今天我去中国, 我一个星期要住在北京。
Jintian wo qu Zhongguo, wo yige xingqi yao zhu zai Beijing.
Today I go China, I one week want stay in Beijing
Today I am going to China and I'll stay in Beijing for a week.

C: 今天我去中国, 我要住在北京一个星期。
Jintian wo qu Zhongguo, wo yao zhu zai Beijing yige xingqi.
Today I go China, I want stay in Beijing one week
Today I am going to China and I'll stay in Beijing for a week.

176. E: 我喜欢几个星期游览在每一个国家。
Wo xihuan jige xingqi youlan zai yige guojia.
I like several weeks travel at one country
I like to travel for several weeks in every country.

C: 我喜欢在每一个国家游览几个星期。
Wo xihuan zai yige guojia youlan jige xingqi.
I like at one country travel several weeks
I like to travel for several weeks in every country.

3.3.3 177. E: 我不[没]见你多[好几个]月。
Wo mei jian ni haoyige yue.
I not see you several months
I haven't seen you for several months.

C: 我好几个月没见你了。
Wo hao jige yue mei jian ni le.
I several months not see you LE
I haven't seen you for several months.

178. E: 我没看[见]你三个月, 你好吗?
Wo mei jian ni san ge yue, ni hao ma?
I not see you three months, you good Ma?
I haven't seen you for three months and how are you?

C: 我三个月没见你了, 你好吗?
Wo san ge yue mei jian ni le, ni hao ma?
I three months not see you LE, you good Ma?
I haven't seen you for three months and how are you?

3.4 179. E: 我给这个蛋糕我的男朋友。
Wo gei zhege dangao wo de nan pengyou.
I give this cake my boyfriend
I will give this cake to my boyfriend.

C: 我给我的男朋友这个蛋糕。
Wo gei wo de nan pengyou zhege dangao.
I give my boyfriend this cake
I will give this cake to my boyfriend.

180. E: 妈妈买了手表给我生日礼物。
Mama mai le shoubiao gei wo shengri liwu.
Mum buy LE watch give me birthday gift
Mum bought me a watch as my birthday gift.

C: 妈妈给我买了手表[作]生日礼物。
Mama gei wo mai le shoubiao zuo shengri liwu.
Mum for me buy LE watch [as] birthday gift
Mum bought me a watch as my birthday gift.

181. E: 我的男朋友买了中文书给我。
Wo de nan pengyou mai le zhongwen shu gei wo.
My boyfriend bought Chinese book for me
My boyfriend has bought a Chinese book for me.

C: 我的男朋友给我买了中文书。
Wo de nan pengyou gei wo mai le zhongwen shu.
My boyfriend for me bought Chinese book
My boyfriend has bought a Chinese book for me.

3.5.1 182. E. 弟弟住一块儿跟父母。
Didi zhu yikuair gen fumu.
Younger brother live together with parents
(My) younger brother lives together with (our) parents.

C: 弟弟跟父母住一块儿。
Didi gen fumu zhu yikuair.
Younger brother with parents live together
(My) younger brother lives together with (our) parents.

183. E: (她是我的最好朋友), 我们住在一块儿英国。
Women zhu zai yikuair yingguo.
We live in together the UK
We used to live together in the UK.

C: 我们在英国住一块儿。
Women zai yingguo zhu yikuair.
We in the UK live together
We used to live together in the UK.

184. E: 这次去长城是我去第一次。
Zheci qu Changcheng shi wo qu di yici.
This time go to the Great Wall is I go the first time
This is my first visit to the Great Wall.

C: 这次去长城是我第一次去。
Zheci qu Changcheng shi wo di yici qu.
This time go to the Great Wall is I the first time go
This is my first visit to the Great Wall.

185. E: (我喜欢吃中国饭), 特别是吃午饭跟我北京的朋友一起。
Tebie shi chi wufan gen wo Beijing de pengyou yiqi.
Especially is eat lunch with I Beijing's friends together
I especially like having lunch together with my friends in Beijing.

C: 特别是跟我北京的朋友一起吃午饭。
Tebie shi gen wo Beijing de pengyou yiqi chi wufan.
Especially is with I Beijing's friends together eat lunch
I especially like having lunch together with my friends in Beijing.

186. E: 昨天我去吃晚饭跟我男朋友的家人。
Zuotian wo qu chi wanfan gen wo nan pengyou de jiaren.
Yesterday I go eat dinner with I boyfriend's family
Yesterday I went to have dinner with my boyfriend's family.

C: 昨天我去跟我男朋友的家人吃 晚饭。
Zuotian wo qu gen wo nan pengyou de jiaren chi wanfan.
Yesterday I go with I boyfriend's family eat dinner
Yesterday I went to have dinner with my boyfriend's family.

187. E: 我试谈中国话跟他们。
Wo shi tan zhongguohua gen tamen.
I try talk Chinese with them
I try to speak Chinese with them.

C: 我试[着]跟他们说中国话。
Wo shizhe gen tamen shuo zhongguohua.
I try with them speak Chinese
I try to speak Chinese with them.

188. E: 可是困难谈跟他们。
Keshi kunnan tan gen tamen.
However difficult talk with them
However it is difficult to speak (Chinese) with them.

C: 可是跟他们谈[很]困难。
Keshi gen tamen tan hen kunnan.
However with them talk very difficult
However it is difficult to speak (Chinese) with them.

189. E: 我吃饭用筷子了。
Wo chifan yong kuaizi le.
I eat meal with chopsticks LE
I had dinner with chopsticks.

C: 我用筷子吃饭了。
Wo yong kuaizi chifan le.
I with chopsticks eat meal LE
I had dinner with chopsticks.

190. E: 在悉尼我们打算一起住跟老朋友小陆。
Zai Xini women dasuan yiqi zhu gen lao pengyou Xiao Lu.
At Sydney we plan together stay with old friend Xiao Lu
We are planning to stay with (our) old friend Xiao Lu in Sydney.

C: 在悉尼我们打算跟老朋友小陆一起住。
Zai Xini women dasuan gen lao pengyou Xiao Lu yiqi zhu.
At Sydney we plan with old friend Xiao Lu together stay
We are planning to stay with (our) old friend Xiao Lu in Sydney.

191. E: 昨天我回来了中国跟我的家。
Zuotian wo huilai le Zhongguo gen wo de jia.
Yesterday I returen LE China with my family
Yesterday I came back to China with my family.

C: 昨天我跟我的家[人]回中国来了。
Zuotian wo gen wo de jiaren hui Zhongguo lai le.
Yesterday I with my family returen China LE
Yesterday I came back to China with my family.

192. E: 星期五我打网球和我的女朋友。
Xingqiwu wo da wangqiu he wo de nü pengyou.
Friday I play tennis with my girlfriend
I played tennis with my girlfriend on Friday.

C: 星期五我和我的女朋友打网球。
Xingqiwu wo he wo de nü pengyou da wangqiu.
Friday I with my girlfriend play tennis
I played tennis with my girlfriend on Friday.

193. E: 上个晚上[昨天晚上]我去看电影和我的朋友。
Zuotian wangshang wo qu kan dianying he wo de pengyou.
Yesterday evening I go see film with my friend
I went to see a film with my friend last night.

C: 昨天晚上我和我的朋友去看电影。
Zuotian wangshang wo he wo de pengyou qu kan dianying.
Yesterday evening I with my friend go see film
I went to see a film with my friend last night.

194. E: 今晚我去看电影和我的朋友。
Jinwan wo qu kan dianying he wo de pengyou.
This evening I go see film with my friend
I am going to see a film with my friend this evening.

C: 今晚我和我的朋友去看电影。
Jinwan wo he wo de pengyou qu kan dianying.
This evening I with my friend go see film
I am going to see a film with my friend this evening.

195. E: 今晚我去看足球比赛和我的家[人]。
Jinwan wo qu kan zuqiu bisai he wo de jiaren.
This evening I go see football match with my family
This evening I am going to see a football match with my family.

C: 今晚我和我的家人去看足球比赛。
Jinwan wo he wo de jiaren qu kan zuqiu bisai.
This evening I with my family go see football match
This evening I am going to see a football match with my family.

196. E: 这个星期六晚上我不能去生日会跟朋友。
Zhe ge xingqiliu wanshang wo buneng qu shengrihui gen pengyou.
This Saturday evening I cannot go birthday party with friend
This Saturday evening I cannot go to the birthday party with friends.

C: 这个星期六晚上我不能跟朋友去生日会。
Zhe ge xingqiliu wanshang wo buneng gen pengyou qu shengrihui.
This Saturday evening I cannot with friend go birthday party
This Saturday evening I cannot go to the birthday party with friends.

197. E: 你今天为什么不一起去跟她?
Ni jintian weishenme bu yiqi qu gen ta?
You today why not together to with her?
Why don't you go together with her today?

C: 你今天为什么不跟她一起去?
Ni jintian weishenme bu gen ta yiqi qu?
You today why not with her together to?
Why don't you go together with her today?

198. E: (我十点以前平常不能起床), 所以我今晚想睡觉很早。
Suoyi wo jinwan xiang shuijiao hen zao.
So I this evening want go to bed very early
So I would like to go to bed very early this evening.

C: 所以我今晚想很早睡觉。
Suoyi wo jinwan xiang hen zao shuijiao.
So I this evening want very early go to bed
So I would like to go to bed very early this evening.

199. E: (现在我觉得很累)因为我才今天上午八点到了。
Yinwei wo cai jintian shangwu badian dao le.
Because I *Cai* today morning 8.00 am arrive LE
Because I only arrived (here) at 8.00 am this morning.

C: 因为我今天上午八点才到。
Yinwei wo jintian shangwu badian cai dao.
Because I today morning 8.00 am *Cai* arrive
Because I only arrived (here) at 8.00 am this morning.

200. E: 跳舞会完, 就我们去看一个新电影。
Tiaowuhui wan, jiu women qu kan yi ge xin dianying.
Dance party finish, *Jiu* we go see one new film
Just after the dancing party, we went to see a new film.

C: 舞会完后, 我们就去看一个新电影。
Wuhui wan hou, women jiu qu kan yi ge xin dianying.
Dance party finish after, we *Jiu* go see one new film
Just after the dancing party, we went to see a new film.

201. E: 你太太得也来。
Ni tai tai dei ye lai.
You wife have to as well come
Your wife must come as well.

C: 你太太也得来。
Ni tai tai ye dei lai.
You wife as well have to come
Your wife must come as well.

202. E: (下个月我很忙), 我有我的考试, 也我搬家。
Wo you wo de kaoshi, ye wo banjia.
I have my exam, as well I move
I have an exam and I have to move house as well.

C: 我有考试, 我也搬家。
Wo you kaoshi, wo ye banjia.
I have exam, I as well move
I have an exam and I have to move house as well.

203. E: 北京风景太美了, 也北京的变化不小啊。
Beijing fengjing tai mei le, *ye Beijing de bianhua bu xiao a*.
Beijing scenery so beautiful, also *Beijing*'s change not small
Beijing's scenery is so beautiful and the change is also so great!

C: 北京风景太美了, 北京的变化也不小啊。
Beijing fengjing tai mei le, *Beijing de bianhua ye bu xiao a*.
Beijing scenery so beautiful, *Beijing*'s change also not small
Beijing's scenery is so beautiful and the change is also so great!

204. E: 我们打算吃烤肉和烤鸭, 也我们喝白酒。
Women dasuan chi kaoro he kao ya, ye women he baijiu.
We plan eat roast meat and roast duck, too we drink alcohol
We plan to have roast meat, roast duck and alcohol as well.

C: 我们打算吃烤肉和烤鸭, 我们也喝白酒。
Women dasuan chi kaoro he kao ya, women ye he baijiu.
We plan eat roast meat and roast duck, we too drink alcohol
We plan to have roast meat, roast duck and alcohol as well.

205. E: (我的家在火车站旁边), 你能来坐火车。
Ni neng lai zuo huo che.
You can come sit train
You can come (to my place) by train.

C: 你能坐火车来。
Ni neng zuo huo che lai.
You can sit train come
You can come (to my place) by train.

206. E: 那儿的风景不错, 我们照相不停。
Nar de fengjing bu cuo, women zhaoxiang bu ting.
There *de* scenery not bad, wo take picture not stop
The scenery there was so good that we kept taking pictures.

C: 那儿的风景不错, 我们不停地照相。
Nar de fengjing bu cuo, women bu ting de zhaoxiang.
There *de* scenery not bad, wo not stop *de* take picture
The scenery there was so good that we kept taking pictures.

207. E: 他告诉我"先你应该顺那个路一直往前走"。
Ta gaosu wo "xian ni yinggai shun nage lu yizhi wang qian zou".
He tell me "firstly you should along that road straight toward front walk"
He told me "You should firstly walk ahead along that road".

C: 他告诉我"你应该先顺那个路一直往前走"。
Ta gaosu wo "ni yinggai xian shun nage lu yizhi wang qian zou".
He tell me "you should firstly along that road straight toward front walk"
He told me "You should firstly walk ahead along that road".

208. E: 几乎始终我呆在家里。
Jihu shizhong wo dai zai jiali.
Almost all the time I stay at home
I stayed at home almost all the time.

C: 我几乎始终呆在家里。
Wo jihu shizhong dai zai jiali.
I almost all the time stay at home
I stayed at home almost all the time.

209. E: 我祖母祖父都身体很好。
Wo zufu zumu dou shenti hen hao.
I grandmother grandfather all health very good
My grandmother and grandfather both enjoy good health.

C: 我祖母祖父身体都很好。
Wo zufu zumu shenti dou hen hao.
I grandmother grandfather health all very good
My grandmother and grandfather both enjoy good health.

3.5.2 210. E: 上个周末我们开心玩[得]。
Shang ge zhoumo women kaixin wan de.
Last weekend we happy play DE
We had a good time last weekend.

C: 上个周末我们玩得开心。
Shang ge zhoumo women wan de kaixin.
Last weekend we play *de* happy
We had a good time last weekend.

211. E: 我考试的时候不睡着因为我紧张。
Wo kaoshi de shihou bu shui zhao yinwei wo jinzhang.
I exam's time not sleep a sleep because I nervous
I cannot sleep when I have an exam because I am nervous.

C: 我考试的时候睡不着因为我紧张。
Wo kaoshi de shihou shui bu zhao yinwei wo jinzhang.
I exam's time sleep not a sleep because I nervous
I cannot sleep when I have an exam because I am nervous.

212. E: 要让老师给我讲考试一下儿。
Yao rang laoshi gei wo jiang kaoshi yixiar.
Want let teacher for me talk exam once
(I) would like to have the teacher talk a bit about the exam for me.

C: 要让老师给我讲一下儿考试。
Yao rang laoshi gei wo jiang yixiar kaoshi.
Want let teacher for me talk once exam
(I) would like to have the teacher talk a bit about the exam for me.

3.6 213. E: 今天早上我没有早起来, 因为不够睡眠。
Jintian zaoshang wo mei you zao qilai yinwei bu gou shuimian.
Today morning I not have early get up because not enough sleep
I did not get up early this morning because (I) did not have enough sleep.

C: 因为睡眠不够, 今天早上我没有早起来。
Yinwei shuimian bu gou, jintian zaoshang wo mei you zao qilai.
Because sleep not enough, today morning I not have early get up
I didn't get up early this morning because (I) didn't have enough sleep.

214. E: 我二十分要等因为我的飞机一点儿慢[晚]。
Wo ershifen yao deng yinwei wo de feiji yi dianr man.
I twenty minutes want wait because my plane a bit late
I have to wait for twenty minutes because my plane is a bit late.

C: 因为我的飞机有点儿晚了, 我要等二十分。
Yinwei wo de feiji you dianr wan le, wo yao deng ershifen.
Because my plane a bit late LE, I want wait twenty minutes
I have to wait for twenty minutes because my plane is a bit late.

215. E: 我考试的时候不睡着因为我紧张。
Wo kaoshi de shihou bu shui zhao yinwei wo jinzhang.
I exam's time not sleep because I nervous
I cannot sleep when I have an exam because I get nervous.

C: 因为我紧张, 我考试的时候睡不着。
Yinwei wo jinzhang, wo kaoshi de shihou shui bu zhao.
Because I nervous, I exam's time sleep not well
I cannot sleep when I have an exam because I get nervous.

4.1 216. E: 五时半下午的时候我来到北京飞机场。
Wushiban xiawu de shihou wo lai dao Beijing feijichang.
5.30 afternoon *de* time I come arrive Beijing airport
I arrived at Beijing airport at 5.30 pm.

C: 下午五时半的时候我来到北京飞机场。
Xiawu wushiban de shihou wo lai dao Beijing feijichang.
Afternoon 5.30 *de* time I come arrive Beijing airport
I arrived at Beijing airport at 5.30 pm.

217. E: 我在大学从八点上午到七点晚上念书。
Wo zai daxue cong badian shangwu dao qidian wanshang nianshu.
I at University from 8.00 morning to 7.00 evening read book
I have been reading at the university from 8 am to 7 pm.

C: 我从上午八点到晚上七点在大学念书。
Wo cong shangwu badian dao wanshang qidian zai daxue nianshu.
I from morning 8.00 to evening 7.00 at University read book
I have been reading at the university from 8 am to 7 pm.

218. E: 我的生日会七点晚上开始。
Wo de shengrihui qidian wanshang kaishi.
My birthday party 7.00 evening start
My birthday party starts at 7.00 pm.

C: 我的生日会晚上七点开始。
Wo de shengrihui wanshang qidian kaishi.
My birthday party evening 7.00 start
My birthday party starts at 7.00 pm.

4.2 219. E: 我家在十二号 cedar 路。
Wo jia zai shiren hao cedar lu.
I home at 12 number Cedar Road
My home address is No. 12, Cedar Road.

C: 我家在 cedar 路十二号。
Wo jia zai Cedar lu shiren hao.
I home at 12 number Cedar Road
My home address is No. 12, Cedar Road.

220. E: 我的新地址在四号 Gailey 路, Taringa。
Wo de xin dizhi zai sihao Gailey Lu, Taringa
My new address at 4 number Gailey Road, Taringa
My new address is No. 4, Gailey Road, Taringa.

C: 我的新地址在 Taringa, Gailey 路, 四号。
Wo de xin dizhi zai Taringa, Gailey Lu, sihao.
My new address at Taringa, Gailey Road, 4 number
My new address is No. 4, Gailey Road, Taringa.

221. E: 我家在三十五号 Musgrave 路。
Wo jia zai sanshiwu hao Musgrave Lu.
I home at 35 number Musgrave Road
My home address is No. 35, Musgrave Road.

C: 我家在 Musgrave 路, 三十五号。
Wo jia zai Musgrave Lu, sanshiwu hao.
I home at Musgrave Road 35 number
My home address is No. 35, Musgrave Road.

222. E: 我的新地址是 15, Strawberry St. Sunnybank。
Wo de xin dizhi shi shiwu, Strawberry jie, Sunnybank.
My new address is 15 Strawberry St. Sunnybank
My new address is 15 Strawberry St. Sunnybank.

C: 我的新地址是 Sunnybank 区 Strawberry 街, 15号。
Wo de xin dizhi shi Sunnybank qu, Strawberry jie shiwu hao.
My new address is Sunnybank district, Strawberry St, 15 number
My new address is 15 Strawberry St. Sunnybank.

223. E: 我的新地址是六号中汉路。
Wo de xin dizhi shi liu hao Zhonghan Lu.
My new address is 6 number Zhonghan Road
My new address is No. 6, Zhonghan Road.

C: 我的新地址是中汉路六号。
Wo de xin dizhi shi Zhonghan Lu liu hao.
My new address is Zhonghan Road 6 number
My new address is No. 6, Zhonghan Road.

224. E: 地点是十九号 Robertson 街。
Didian shi shijiu hao Robertson Jie.
The place is 19 number Robertson Street
The place is No. 19, Robertson Street.

C: 地点是 Robertson 街十九号。
Didian shi Robertson Jie shijiu hao.
The place is Robertson Street 19 number
The place is No. 19, Robertson Street.

225. E: 我的新地址在189号女王大街。
Wo de xin dizhi zai 189 hao Nüwang Da Jie.
My new address at 189 number Queen Avenue
My new address is at No. 189, Queen Avenue.

C: 我的新地址在女王大街189号。
Wo de xin dizhi zai Nüwang Da Jie 189 hao.
My new address at Queen Avenue 189 number
My new address is at No. 189, Queen Avenue.

226. E: 我的新住址是二十五号玛丽借[街]。
Wo de xin dizhi shi ershiwu hao Mali Jie.
My new address is 25 number Mary Street
My new address is No. 25, Mary Street.

C: 我的新住址是玛丽街二十五号。
Wo de xin dizhi shi Mali Jie ershiwu hao.
My new address is Mary Street 25 number
My new address is No. 25, Mary Street.

227. E: 你知道我的新地址吗?是五号明山路。
Ni zhidao wo de xin dizhi ma? Shi wu hao Mingshan Lu.
You know my new address? Is 5 number Mingshan Road
Do you know my new address? (It) is No. 5, Mingshan Road.

C: 你知道我的新地址吗?是明山路五号。
Ni zhidao wo de xin dizhi ma? Shi Mingshan Lu wu hao.
You know my new address? Is Mingshan Road 5 number
Do you know my new address? (It) is No. 5, Mingshan Road.

228. E: 我的新地址是二十二号北京街。
Wo de xin dizhi shi ershier hao Beijing Jie.
My new address is 22 number Beijing Street
My new address is No. 22, Beijing Street.

C: 我的新地址是北京街二十二号。
Wo de xin dizhi shi Beijing Jie ershier hao.
My new address is Beijing Street 22 number
My new address is No. 22, Beijing Street.

229. E: 我家在六十七号国王路。
Wo jia zai liushiqi hao Guowang Lu.
I home at 67 number King Road
My home address is at No. 67, King Road.

C: 我家在国王路六十七号。
Wo jia zai Guowang Lu liushiqi hao.
I home at King Road 67 number
My home address is at No. 67, King Road.

230. E: 我的新地址是二号小河街。
Wo de xin dizhi shi er hao Xiaohe Jie.
My new address is 2 number Rivulet Street
My new address is No. 2, Rivulet Street.

C: 我的新地址是小河街二号。
Wo de xin dizhi shi Xiaohe Jie er hao.
My new address is Rivulet Street 2 number
My new address is No. 2, Rivulet Street.

231. E: (我们的飞机三点三刻飞, 现在是四点五分了),
所以我们在里面的飞机了。
Suoyi women zai limian de feiji le.
Therefore we at inside the plane LE
Therefore we were inside the plane.

C: 所以我们在飞机的里面了。
Suoyi women zai feiji de limian le.
Therefore we at the plane inside LE
Therefore we were inside the plane.

232. E: (今天我父母打算请我伯伯和他们家吃晚饭)
我[们]家七点半相遇他们在里面的饭馆。
Women jia qidianban xiangyu tamen zai limian de fanguan.
My family 7.30 meet them at inside resturant
My family are going to meet them at 7.30 pm inside the resturant.

C: 我们家七点半在饭馆的里面与他们相见。
Women jia qidianban zai fanguan de limian yu tamen xiangjian.
My family 7.30 at resturant inside with them meet
My family are going to meet them at 7.30 pm inside the resturant.

4.3 233. E: 我的生日会举行星期六六点在我的新家。
Wo de shengrihui juxing xingqiliu liudian zai wo de xin jia.
My birthday party hold Saturday 6.00 at my new home
My birthday party will be held at 6 pm on Saturday at my new home.

C: 我的生日会星期六六点在我的新家举行。
Wo de shengrihui xingqiliu liudian zai wo de xin jia juxing.
My birthday party Saturday 6.00 at my new home hold
My birthday party will be held at 6pm on Saturday at my new home.

234. E: 星期六晚上有聚会在我家。
Xingqi liu wanshang you juhui zai wo jia.
Saturday evening have getting together party at my home
There is a party on the coming Saturday evening at my home.

C: 星期六晚上在我家有聚会。
Xingqi liu wanshang zai wo jia you juhui.
Saturday evening at my home have getting together party
There is a party on the coming Saturday evening at my home.

235. E: 下星期我宴请在我的家。
Xia xingqi wo yanqing zai wo de jia.
Next week I treat (you people) at my home
Next week I'll treat you people at my home.

C: 下星期在我的家我宴请大家。
Xia xingqi zai wo de jia wo yanqing dajia.
Next week at my home I treat people
Next week I'll treat you people at my home.

236. E: 我和我朋友一起吃午饭在那里。
Wo he wo pengyou yiqi chi wufan zai nali.
I and I friend together eat lunch at there
My friends and I had lunch together there.

C: 我和我朋友一起在那里吃午饭。
Wo he wo pengyou yiqi zai nali chi wufan.
I and I friend together at there eat lunch
My friends and I had lunch together there.

237. E: 我在大学从八点上午到七点晚上念书。
Wo zai daxue cong badian shangwu dao qidian wanshang nianshu.
I at University from 8 morning to 7 evening read book
I have been reading in the University from 8 am to 7 pm.

C: 我从上午八点到晚上七点在大学念书。
Wo cong shangwu badian dao wanshang qidian zai daxue nianshu.
I from morning 8 to evening 7 at University read book
I have been reading in the University from 8 am to 7 pm.

238. E: 我家七点半相遇他们在里面的饭馆[在饭馆里面]。
Wo jia qidianban xiangyu tamen zai fanguan limian.
My family 7.30 meet them at resturant inside
My family will meet them at 7.30, inside the resturant.

C: 我家七点半在饭馆里面与他们相见。
Wo jia qidianban zai fanguan limian yu tamen xiangjian.
My family 7.30 at resturant inside with them meet
My family will meet them at 7.30, inside the resturant.

239. E: 早晨很多老人散步在公园里。
Zaochen henduo laoren sanbu zai gongyuan li.
Morning many old people take a walk at the park inside
Many elderly people take a walk in the park early in the morning.

C: 早晨很多老人在公园里散步。
Zaocen henduo laoren zai gongyuan li sanbu.
Morning many old people at the park inside take a walk
Many elderly people take a walk in the park early in the morning.

4.4

240. E: 几个我们的朋友也来我家。
Jige women de pengyou ye lai wo jia.
Several our friend also come I home
Several friends of ours are also coming to my home.

C: 我们的几个朋友也来我家。
Women de jige pengyou ye lai wo jia.
Our several friend also come I home
Several friends of ours are also coming to my home.

241. E: 昨天我没想到见了一个我的老同学。
Zuotian wo mei xiang dao jian le yige wo de lao tongxue.
Yesterday I not think see Le one my old classmate
I did not expect to see an old classmate of mine yesterday.

C: 昨天我没想到见了我的一个老同学。
Zuotian wo mei xiang dao jian le wo de yige lao tongxue.
Yesterday I not think see Le my one old classmate
I did not expect to see an old classmate of mine yesterday.

242. E: 我会[交]了几个新大学的朋友。
Wo jiao le ji ge xin daxue de pengyou.
I make LE several new university DE friend
I have made a few new friends in the university.

C: 我交了大学的几个新朋友。
Wo jiao le daxue de ji ge xin pengyou.
I make LE university *de* several new friend
I have made a few new friends in the university.

243. E: 下星期一个我的朋友正要去日本学日文。
Xia xingqi yige wo de pengyou zheng yao qu riben xue riwen.
Next Monday one my friend is going Japan study Japanese
One of my friends is going to Japan next Monday to study Japanese.

C: 下星期我的一个朋友正要去日本学日文。
Xia xingqi wo de yige pengyou zheng yao qu riben xue riwen.
Next Monday my one friend is going Japan study Japanese
One of my friends is going to Japan next Monday to study Japanese.

244. E: 学中文是一个好体验人生的。
Xue Zhongwen shi yige hao tiyan rensheng de.
Study Chinese is one good experience life's
Studying Chinese is a good experience in life.

C: 学中文是人生的一个好体验。
Xue Zhongwen shi rensheng de yige hao tiyan.
Study Chinese is life's one good experience
Studying Chinese is a good experience in life.

245. E: 一个我的愿望是去西安。
Yige wo de yuanwang shi qu X'ian.
One my wish is go Xi'an
One of my wishes is to go to Xi'an.

C: 我的一个愿望是去西安。
Wo de yige yuanwang shi qu Xi'an.
My one wish is go Xi'an
One of my wishes is to go to Xi'an.

246. E: 大伟比我两个公尺高。
Dawei bi wo liangge gongchi gao.
David compare I two cm tall
David is two cm taller than I am.

C: 大伟比我高两公尺。
Dawei bi wo gao liang gongchi.
David compare I tall two cm
David is two cm taller than I am.

247. E: 我十点以前平常不能起床, (所以我今晚想睡觉很早)。
Wo shidan yiqian pingchang buneng qichuang.
I ten before usually not can get up
I usually can not get up before ten o'clock.

C: 我平常十点以前起不了床, (所以我今晚想睡觉很早)。
Wo pingchang shidan yiqiang qi bu liao chuang.
I usually ten before get not LE up
I usually can not get up before ten o'clock.

5. 248. E: 我打算看全[所有]朋友我学校。
Wo dasuan kan suo you pengyou wo xuexiao.
I plan see all friends I school
I'm planning to see all my school friends.

C: 我打算看我学校的所有朋友。
Wo dasuan kan wo xuexiao de suo you pengyou.
I plan see I school's all friends
I'm planning to see all my school friends.

249. E: 有多学生昆士兰大学比中学。
You duo xuesheng Kunshilan Daxue bi zhongxue.
Have more students Queensland University compare high school
There are more students at UQ than that at high school.

C: 昆士兰大学比中学有更多学生。
Kunshilan Daxue bi zhongxue you geng duo xuesheng.
Queensland University compare high school have more students
There are more students at UQ than that at high school.

250. E: 有很多好吃的水果在我的家乡。
You henduo haochi de shuiguo zai wo de jiaxiang.
Have many delicious fruit in my hometown
There are many yummy fruits in my hometown.

C: 在 我的家乡有很多好吃的水果。
Zai wo de jiaxiang you henduo haochi de shuiguo.
In my hometown have many delicious fruit
There are many yummy fruits in my hometown.

6. No word order error was found in this category.

7. 251. E: 我不行吃饭用筷子。
Wo buxing chifan yong kuaizi.
I not work eat meal with chopsticks
I am not good at eating with chopsticks.

C: 我用筷子吃饭不行。
Wo yong kuaizi chifan buxing.
I with chopsticks eat meal not work
I am not good at eating with chopsticks.

252. E: (今天早上我回到澳大利亚), 我很高兴看[到]我的家[人]在机场。
Wo hen gaoxing kandao wo de jiaren zai jichang.
I very happy see my family at airport
I am very happy to see my family at the airport.

C: 看到我的家人在机场我很高兴。
Kandao wo de jiaren zai jichang wo hen gaoxing.
See my family at airport I very happy
I am very happy to see my family at the airport.

253. E: 我还我的书了。
Wo huan wo de shu le.
I return my book LE
My book has been returned.

C: 我的书还了。
Wo de shu huan le.
My book return LE
My book has been returned.

254. E: 很难起床三点半。
Hennan qichuang sandian ban.
Very difficult get up 3.30
It is difficult to get up at 3.30 am.

C: 三点半起床很难。
Sandian ban qichuang hennan.
3.30 am get up very difficult
It is difficult to get up at 3.30 am.

255. E: 可是, 困难跟他们用中文谈话。
Keshi, kunnan gen tamen yong Zhongwen tanhua.
However, difficult with them use Chinese talk
However, it is difficult to talk in Chinese with them.

C: 可是, 跟他们用中文谈话很困难。
Keshi, gen tamen yong Zhongwen tanhua hen kunnan.
However, with them use Chinese talk difficult
However, it is difficult to talk in Chinese with them.

8. 256. E: 长城是我的最喜欢地方。
Changcheng shi wo de zui xihuan difang.
The Great Wall is my most like place
The place I like the most is the Great Wall.

C: 我最喜欢的地方是长城。
Wo zui xihuan de difang shi Changcheng.
My most like place is the Great Wall
The place I like the most is the Great Wall.

257. E: 星期天是七点半的电影。
Xingqi tian shi qidianban de dianying.
Sunday is 7.30's film
The film on Sunday is at 7.30 pm.

C: 星期天的电影是七点半的。
Xingqi tian de dianying shi qidianban de.
Sunday's film is 7.30's
The film on Sunday is at 7.30 pm.

258. E: (北京下雪了), 这是永远在布里斯本看不到的。
Zheshi yongyuan zai Bulisiben kan bu dao de.
This is forever at Brisbane see not arrive De
This is what we can never see in Brisbane.

C: 在布里斯本这是永远看不到的。
Zai Bulisiben zheshi yongyuan kan bu dao de.
At Brisbane this is forever see not arrive De
This is what we can never see in Brisbane.

9. 259. E: 我妈妈爸爸想去看望我婆婆和公公和奶奶和爷爷。
Wo mama baba xiang qu kanwang wo popo he gonggong he nainai he yeye.
I Mum Dad want go see I maternal grandma and grandpa and paternal grandma and grandpa
My Mum and Dad want to visit my maternal and paternal grandparents.

C: 我爸爸妈妈想去看望我公公婆婆和爷爷奶奶。
Wo baba mama xiang qu kanwang wo gonggong popo he yeye nainai.
I Dad Mum want go see I maternal grandpa grandma and paternal grandpa grandma
My Mum and Dad want to visit my maternal and paternal grandparents.

260. E: 我祖母祖父都身体很好。
Wo zumu zufu dou shenti henhao.
I grandma grandpa all health very good
Both my grandma and grandpa enjoy good health.

C: 我祖父祖母身体都很好。
Wo zufu zumu shenti dou henhao.
I grandpa grandma health all very good
Both my grandma and grandpa enjoy good health.

261. E: 上个星期我去了看我妈妈爸爸。
Shangge xingqi wo qu le kan wo mama baba.
Last week I go LE see I Mum Dad
I went to see my Mum and Dad last week.

C: 上个星期我去看了我爸爸妈妈。
Shangge xingqi wo qu kan le wo baba mama.
Last week I go see LE I Dad Mum
I went to see my Mum and Dad last week.

10. other 262. E: 我要在北京工作奥林匹克翻译。
Wo yao zai Beijing gongzuo Aolinpike fanyi.
I want at Beijing work Olympic interpreter
I would like to work in Beijing as an Olympic interpreter.

C: 我要在北京做奥林匹克翻译工作。
Wo yao zai Beijing zuo Aolinpike fanyi gongzuo.
I want at Beijing do Olympic interpreter work
I would like to work in Beijing as an Olympic interpreter.

263. E: 在北京的第一天我头疼, 睡觉了一下儿就好了。
Zai Beijing de diyitian wo tou teng, shuijiao le yixiar jiu hao le.
On Beijing *de* first day I headache, sleep LE a while then good LE
On the first day in Beijing, I had a headache and I was fine after sleeping for a while.

C: 在北京的第一天我头疼, 睡了一觉就好了。
Zai Beijing de diyitian wo tou teng, shui le yi jiao jiu hao le.
On Beijing *de* first day I headache, sleep LE a sleep then good LE
On the first day in Beijing, I had a headache and I was fine after sleeping for a while.

From level 3 learners (145 word order errors in total)

Category Word order errors and corresponding correct forms

1.1 264. E: 可以你给我介绍自己吗?
Keyi ni gei wo jieshao ziji ma?
Can you for me introduce yourself
Can you introduce yourself to me please?

C: 你可以介绍一下自己吗?
Ni keyi jieshao yi xiar ziji ma?
You can introduce briefly yourself
Can you introduce yourself to me please?

265. E: 为什么你学日文和韩文呢?
Weishenme ni xue Riwen he Hanwen ne?
Why you study Japanese and Korean
Why do you study Japanese and Korean?

C: 你为什么学日文和韩文呢?
Ni weishenme xue Riwen he Hanwen ne?
You why study Japanese and Korean
Why do you study Japanese and Korean?

266. E: 你知道日记什么写吗?
Ni zhidao riji shenme xie ma?
You know diary what write Ma
Do you know what to write for the diary?

C: 你知道日记写什么吗?
Ni zhidao riji xie shenme ma?
You know diary write what Ma
Do you know what to write for the diary?

1.2 267. E: 那个孩子不及格他的考试。
Nage haizi bu jige ta de kaoshi.
That child not pass his exam
That child did not pass his exam.

C: 那个孩子考试不及格。
Nage haizi kaoshi bu jige.
That child exam not pass
That child did not pass his exam.

268. E: 我北京的朋友不好身体, 常常感冒。
Wo Beijing de pengyou bu hao shenti, changchang ganmao.
I Beijing's friend not good health, often cold
My friend in Beijing does not enjoy good health and s/he often catches cold.

C: 我北京的朋友身体不好, 常常感冒。
Wo Beijing de pengyou shenti bu hao, changchang ganmao.
I Beijing's friend health not good, often cold
My friend in Beijing does not enjoy good health and s/he often catches cold.

269. E: 父母吵架, 家里有不好的气氛。
Fumu chaojia, jiali you bu hao de qifen.
Parents quarrel, home inside not good atmosphere
The atmosphere is not good at home because parents often quarrel.

C: 父母老吵架, 家里气氛不好。
Fumu lao chaojia, jiali qifen bu hao.
Parents often quarrel, home inside atmosphere not good
The atmosphere is not good at home because parents often quarrel.

270. E: 我爷爷病了, 然后[后来]治好他的病了。
Wo yeye bing le, houlai zhihao ta de bing le.
I grandpa ill LE, later cure his illness LE
My grandpa was ill and later his illness was cured.

C: 我爷爷病了, 后来他的病治好了。
Wo yeye bing le, houlai ta de bing zhihao le.
I grandpa ill LE, later his illness cure LE
My grandpa was ill and later his illness was cured.

271. E: 那儿有不好的房间, 我们取消了房间。
Nar you buhao de fangjian, women quxiao le fangjian.
There have not good hotel room, we cancel LE room
The hotel room there is not good, so we cancelled it.

C: 那儿房间不好, 我们把它退了。
Nar fangjian buhao, women ba ta tui le.
There hotel room not good, we BA it cancel LE
The hotel room there is not good, so we cancelled it.

272. E: 妈妈说会有很好吃的晚饭, (所以你不要吃太多中午饭)。
Mama shuo hui you hen haochi de wanfan,
Mama says will have very good dinner,
Mum says that we are going to have a very good dinner.

C: 妈妈说晚饭会很好吃。
Mama shuo wanfan hui hen haochi
Mama says dinner will very good,
Mum says that we are going to have a very good dinner.

2.1 273. E: 她有长的金色头发。
Ta you chang de jinse toufa.
She has long *de* blonde hair
She has long blonde hair.

C: 她有金色的长头发。
Ta you jinse de chang toufa.
She has blonde long hair
She has long blonde hair.

274. E: 全我的家都去中国了。
Quan wo de jia dou qu Zhongguo le.
All my family all go China LE.
All my family members went to China.

C: 我的全家都去中国了。
Wo de quan jia dou qu Zhongguo le.
My all family all go China LE.
All my family members went to China.

275. E: 中国开始上小学平均的年龄是多少?
Zhongguo kaishi shang xiaoxue pingjun de nian ling shi duoshao?
China begin start primary school average age is how many
What is the average age for kids to start primary school in China?

C: 在中国开始上小学的平均年龄是多少?
Zai Zhongguo kaishi shang xiaoxue de pingjun nian ling shi duoshao?
In China begin start primary school average age is how many
What is the average age for kids to start primary school in China?

276. E: 请不买我礼物, 因为我东西的太多了。
Qing bu mai wo liwu, yinwei wo dongxi de tai duo le.
Please not buy me gift, because I thing *de* too many LE
Please do not buy me anything because I have too many things.

C: 请不要给我买礼物, 因为我的东西太多了。
Qing buyao gei wo mai liwu, yinwei wo de dongxi tai duo le.
Please not want buy me gift, because I thing too many LE
Please do not buy me anything because I have too many things.

2.2 277. E: 我觉得缘故最重要的是他经常不上课。
Wo juede yuangu zui zhongyao de shi ta jingchang bu shangke.
I feel reason most important is he often not go class
I feel that the most important reason is that he often misses class.

C: 我觉得最重要的缘故是他经常不上课。
Wo juede zui zhongyao de yuangu shi ta jingchang bu shangke.
I feel most important reason is he often not go class
I feel that the most important reason is that he often misses class.

278 E: 他懂得这时候不是最好的时候告诉他们他的成绩。
Ta dongde zhe shihou bushi zuihao de shihou gaosu tamen ta de chengji.
He know now not is best time tell them his exam score
He knows that this is not the best time to tell them his marks.

C: 他懂得这不是告诉他们他的成绩的最好时候。
Ta dongde zhebushi gaosu tamen ta de chengji de zuihao shihou.
He know this not tell them his exam score *de* best time
He knows that this is not the best time to tell them his marks.

279. E: 年轻的时候是最好的时候去旅行。
Nianqing de shihou shi zui hao de shihou qu lüxing.
Young time is best time go travel
It is the best time for traveling when we are young.

C: 年轻的时候是去旅行最好的时候。
Nianqing de shihou shi qu lüxing zui hao de shihou.
Young time is go travel best time
It is the best time for traveling when we are young.

280. E: 这是很好机会看看另外的同学你从毕业以后没见。
Zhe shi hen hao jihui kankan lingwai de tongxue ni cong biye yihou meijian.
This is very good opportunity see other classmates you from graduation after not see
This is a very good opportunity to see the classmates who you haven't seen since graduation.

C: 这是个见你从毕业以后没见过的同学的好机会。
Zhe shi ge jian ni cong biye yihou mei jiaguo de tongxue de hao jihui.
This is a see you from graduation after not see classmates good opportunity
This is a very good opportunity to see the classmates who you haven't seen since graduation.

281. E: 我走到一个板凳在一棵树的旁边。
Wo zoudao yige bandeng zai yi ke shu de pangbian.
I walk arrive one bench at one tree beside
I walked to a bench that is located beside a tree.

C: 我走到一个在一棵树旁边的板凳。
Wo zoudao yige zai yi ke shu pangbian de bandeng.
I walk arrive one at one tree beside bench
I walked to a bench that is located beside a tree.

282. E: 我爱去公园靠近我家的。
Wo ai qu gongyuan kaojin wo jia de.
I love go park nearby I home DE.
I love to go the park that is nearby my home.

C: 我爱去靠近我家的公园。
Wo ai qu kaojin wo jia de gongyuan.
I love go nearby I home *de* park.
I love to go the park that is nearby my home.

283. E: 那位朋友是我的好朋友在小学。
Na wei pengyou shi wo de hao pengyou zai xiaoxue.
That M friend is my good friend at primary school
That friend is a good friend of mine from primary school.

C: 那位朋友是我在小学的好朋友。
Na wei pengyou shi wo zai xiaoxue de hao pengyou.
That M friend is my at primary school good friend
That friend is a good friend of mine from primary school.

284. E: 有一天他见到我的表姐在英国做工。
You yitian ta jiadao wo de biaojie zai yingguo zuogong.
Have one day he see my cousin in UK work
One day he saw my cousin who is working in the UK.

C: 有一天他见到我在英国做工的表姐。
You yitian ta jiadao wo zai yingguo zuogong de biaojie.
Have one day he see my in UK work cousin
One day he saw my cousin who is working in the UK.

285. E: 那么我明天回家在澳洲。
Name wo mingtian huijia zai Aozhou.
Then I tomorrow go back home in Australia
Then I'll go back to my home in Australia tomorrow.

C: 那么我明天回在澳洲的家。
Name wo mingtian hui zai Aozhou de jia.
Then I tomorrow go back in Australia home
Then I'll go back to my home in Australia tomorrow.

286. E: 上个星期六我哥哥住美国回来澳大利亚了。
Shang ge xingqiliu wo gege zhu Meiguo huilai Aodaliya le.
Last Saturday I elder brother live America return Australia LE
Last Saturday my elder brother who lives in America came back to Australia.

C: 上个星期六我住美国的哥哥回澳大利亚来了。
Shang ge xingqiliu wo zhu Meigu de gegeo hui Aodaliya lai le.
Last Saturday I live America elder brother return Australia LE
Last Saturday my elder brother who lives in America came back to Australia.

287. E: 我家离地方有电影院不远。
Wo jia li difang you dianying yuan bu yuan.
I home from place have cinema not far
My home is not far from the place where there is a cinema.

C: 我家离有电影院的地方不远。
Wo jia li you dianying yuan de difang bu yuan.
I home from have cinema *de* place not far
My home is not far from the place where there is a cinema.

3.1.1 288. E: 我妈妈是老师, 她每天从家到学校开车。
Wo mama shi laosi, ta meitian cong jia dao xuexiao kaiche.
I Mum is teacher, she everyday from home to school drive
My Mum is a teacher and she drives from home to school every day.

C: 我妈妈是老师, 她每天从家开车到学校。
Wo mama shi laosi, ta meitian cong jia kaiche dao xuexiao.
I Mum is teacher, she everyday from home drive to school
My Mum is a teacher and she drives from home to school every day.

3.1.2 289. E: 很多毕业大学的人没有工作。
Henduo biye daxue de ren meiyou gongzuo.
Many graduate university *de* people not have job
Many people graduated from university do not have a job.

C: 很多大学毕业的人没有工作。
Henduo daxue biye de ren meiyou gongzuo.
Many university graduate *de* people not have job
Many people graduated from university do not have a job.

290. E: 他有59分在考试, 他没有得到60在考试。
Ta you wushijiu fen zai kaoshi, ta mei you dedao liushi zai kaoshi.
He have 59 score in exam, he not have get 60 in exam
He scored 59 marks in his exam, not 60.

C: 他考试得59分, 没有得60分。
Ta kaosh de wushijiu fen, mei you de liushi fen.
He exam get 59 score, not get 60
He scored 59 marks in his exam, not 60.

291. E: (我不去旅游, 因为我要做功课), 也我不想用[花]多钱。
Ye wo buxiang hua duo qian.
Also I not want spend much money
I also do not want to spend too much money.

C: 我也不想多花钱。
Wo ye buxiang duo hua qian.
I also not want much spend money
I also do not want to spend too much money.

292. E: 下次我应该给你写多一点儿。
Xiaci wo yinggai gei ni xie duo yidianr.
Next time I should for you write more little
Next time I should write more for you.

C: 下次我应该给你多写一点儿。
Xiaci wo yinggai gei ni duo xie yidianr.
Next time I should for you more write little
Next time I should write more for you.

293. E: 父母在吵架为了孩子的考试成绩。
Fumu zai chaojia wei le haizi de kaoshi chengji.
Parents are quarrelling for children's exam score
The parents are quarrelling because of their child's exam score.

C: 父母为了孩子的考试成绩在吵架。
Fumu wei le haizi de kaoshi chengji zai chaojia.
Parents for children's exam score are quarrelling
The parents are quarrelling because of their child's exam score.

294. E: 中国的父母很担心对孩子的学习。
Zhongguo de fumu hen danxin dui haizi de xuexi.
Chinese parents very worry towards children's study
Chinese parents worry a lot about their children's study.

C: 中国的父母对孩子的学习很担心。
Zhongguo de fumu dui haizi de xuexi hen danxin.
Chinese parents towards children's study very worry
Chinese parents worry a lot about their children's study.

295. E: 我们决定去游泳海边。
Women jueding qu youyong haibian.
We decide go swim seaside
We have decided to go swimming at the beach.

C: 我们决定去海边游泳。
Women jueding qu haibian youyong.
We decide go seaside swim
We have decided to go swimming at the beach.

296. E: 为了将来挣多钱, 父母希望孩子努力学习。
Wei le jiang lai zheng duo qian, fumu xiwang haizi nuli xuexi.
For future earn more money, parents hope child hard study
Parents hope their children will study hard in order to earn more money in the future.

C: 为了将来多挣钱, 父母希望孩子努力学习。
Wei le jiang lai duo zheng qian, fumu xiwang haizi nuli xuexi.
For future more earn money, parents hope child hard study
Parents hope their children will study hard in order to earn more money in the future.

3.1.3 297. E: 一个警卫来向我。
Yi ge jingwei lai xiang wo.
One security officer come towards me
A security officer came to me.

C: 一个警卫向我走来。
Yi ge jingwei xiang wo zou lai.
One security officer towards me walk come
A security officer came to me.

298. E: 从黄色的钟楼南边你往前走然后拐右。
Cong huangse de zhonglou nanbian ni wang qian zou ranhou guai you.
From yellow clochard south ridge you towards front walk then turn right
Walk ahead from the Southside of the yellow clochard and then turn right.

C: 从黄色的钟楼南边你往前走然后右拐。
Cong huangse de zhonglou nanbian ni wang qian zou ranhou you guai.
From yellow clochard south ridge you towards front walk then right turn
Walk ahead from the Southside of the yellow clochard and then turn right.

299. E: 我有时候跟朋友去出。
Wo you shihou gen pengyou qu chu.
I sometimes with friends go out
Sometimes I go out with friends.

C: 我有时候跟朋友出去。
Wo you shihou gen pengyou chu qu.
I sometimes with friends out go
Sometimes I go out with friends.

300. E: 大学毕业以后她要回去日本。
Daxue biye yihou ta yao hui qu Riben.
University graduate after she want back go Japan
She would like to go back to Japan after graduation from university.

C: 大学毕业以后她要回日本去。
Daxue biye yihou ta yao hui Riben qu.
University graduate after she want back Japan go
She would like to go back to Japan after graduation from university.

301. E: 在国外旅游的时候, 她希望回来澳大利亚。
Zai guowai lüyou de shihou, ta xiwang hui lai Aodaliya.
Travel's time, she hope back come Australia
She missed Australia while she was traveling overseas.

C: 在国外旅游的时候, 她希望回澳大利亚来。
Zai guowai lüyou de shihou, ta xiwang hui Aodaliya lai.
Travel's time, she hope back Australia come
She missed Australia while she was traveling overseas.

302. E: 我提议周末去到山上。
Wo tiyi zhoumo qu dao shanshang.
I suggest weekend go arrive mountain up
I suggest going climbing a mountain on the weekend.

C: 我提议周末到山上去。
Wo tiyi zhoumo dao shanshang qu.
I suggest weekend arrive mountain up go
I suggest going climbing a mountain on the weekend.

303. E: 上个星期六我哥哥住美国回来澳大利亚了。
Shangge xingqiliu wo gege zhu Meiguo hui lai Aodaliya le.
Last Saturday I elder brother live America back come Australia LE.
My elder brother who lives in America came back to Australia last Saturday.

C: 上个星期六我住美国的哥哥回澳大利亚来了。
Shangge xingqiliu wo zhu Meiguo de gege hui Aodaliya lai le.
Last Saturday I live America *de* elder brother back Australia come LE.
My elder brother who lives in America came back to Australia last Saturday.

3.1.4 304. E: 在北京的时候我们去了参观颐和园。
Zai Beijing de shihou women qu le canguan yiheyuan.
At *Beijing*'s time we go LE visit the Summer Place
We went to visit the Summer Place while we were in *Beijing*.

C1: 在北京的时候我们去参观了颐和园。
Zai Beijing de shihou women qu canguan le yiheyuan.
At *Beijing*'s time we go visit LE the Summer Place
We went to visit the Summer Place while we were in *Beijing*.

C2: 在北京的时候我们去参观颐和园了。
Zai Beijing de shihou women qu canguan yiheyuan le.
At *Beijing*'s time we go visit the Summer Place LE
We went to visit the Summer Place while we were in *Beijing*.

3.2.1 305. E: 我学习在布里斯本。
Wo xuexi zai Bulisiben.
I study in Brisbane
I am studying in Brisbane.

C: 我在布里斯本学习。
Wo zai Bulisiben xuexi.
I in Brisbane study
I am studying in Brisbane.

306. E: 他学习信息工程在昆士兰大学。
Ta xuexi xinxi gongcheng zai Kunshilan Daxue.
He study information engineering at the University of Queensland.
He studies information engineering at the University of Queensland.

C: 他在昆士兰大学学习信息工程。
Ta zai Kunshilan Daxue xuexi xinxi gongcheng.
He at the University of Queensland study information engineering.
He studies information engineering at the University of Queensland.

307. E: 冬天的风景太美了在英国。
Dongtian de fengjing tai mei le zai Yingguo.
Winter *de* scenery too beautiful in the UK
The scenery in winter is really beautiful in the UK.

C: 在英国冬天的风景太美了。
Zai Yingguo dongtian de fengjing tai mei le.
In the UK winter *de* scenery too beautiful
The scenery in winter is really beautiful in the UK.

308. E: 北京夏天很热, 我的朋友有空调在他们家里。
Beijing xiatian henre, wo de pengyou you kongtiao zai tamen jiali.
Beijing summer very hot, my friend have air conditioner at their home
Beijing's summer is very hot and my friends have air conditioners in their home.

C: 北京夏天很热, 我的朋友家里有空调。
Beijing xiatian henre, wo de pengyou jiali you kongtiao.
Beijing summer very hot, my friend home have air conditioner
Beijing's summer is very hot and my friends have air conditioners in their home.

309. E: 我需要汉语工作中。
Wo xuyao hanyu gongzuo zhong.
I need Chinese work middle
I need to use the Chinese language in my work.

C: 我工作中需要用汉语。
Wo gongzuo zhong xuyao yong hanyu.
I work middle need use Chinese
I need to use the Chinese language in my work.

3.2.2 No word order error was found in this category.

3.3.1 310. E: 他开始学汉语在十七八岁。
Ta kaishi xue hanyu zai shiqiba sui.
He start study Chinese at 17 18 years
He started learning Chinese when he was 17 or 18.

C: 他在十七八岁时开始学汉语。
Ta zai shiqiba sui shi kaishi xue hanyu.
He at 17 18 years time start study Chinese
He started learning Chinese when he was 17 or 18.

311. E: 请来我家上[下]个星期六六点左右。
Qing lai wo jia xia ge xingqiliu liu dian zuoyou.
Please come I home next Saturday 6 about
Please come to my home at about 6.00 next Saturday.

C: 请下个星期六六点左右来我家。
Qing xia ge xingqiliu liu dian zuoyou lai wo jia.
Please next Saturday 6 about come I home
Please come to my home at about 6:00 next Saturday.

312. E: 我想开始生日宴会晚上六点半右左。
Wo xiang kaishi shengri yanhui wanshang liudianban zuoyou.
I think start birthday party evening 6.30 about
I think that we can start the birthday party at about 6.30 pm.

C: 我想晚上六点半右左开始生日宴会。
Wo xiang wanshang liudianban zuoyou kaishi shengri yanhui.
I think evening 6.30 about start birthday party
I think that we can start the birthday party at about 6.30 pm.

313. E: 我要开一个生日会, 聚会开始六点。
Wo yao kai yige shengrihui, juhui kaishi liu dian.
I want hold one birthday party, party start 6.00
I'll have a birthday party and it will start at 6.00.

C: 我要开一个生日会, 聚会六点开始。
Wo yao kai yige shengrihui, juhui liu dian kaishi.
I want hold one birthday party, party 6.00 start
I'll have a birthday party and it will start at 6.00.

314. E: 那天我走了[离开]家两点半。
Natian wo likai jia liang dian ban.
That day I leave home 2.30
I left home at 2.30 on that day.

C: 那天我两点半离开家。
Natian wo liang dian ban likai jia.
That day I 2.30 leave home
I left home at 2.30 on that day.

3.3.2 315. E: 我们十二天住在意大利。
Women shiertian zhu zai Yidali.
We 12 days stay in Italy
We stayed in Italy for 12 days.

C: 我们住在意大利十二天。
Women s zhu zai Yidali hiertian.
We stay in Italy 12 days
We stayed in Italy for 12 days.

316. E: 往前一分钟走, 就在你的左边。
Wangqian yifenzhong zou, jiu zai ni de zuobian.
Towards front one minute walk, just at your left
Walk ahead for one minute and you'll find it at your left.

C: 往前走一分钟, 就在你的左边。
Wangqian zou yifenzhong, jiu zai ni de zuobian.
Towards front walk one minute, just at your left
Walk ahead for one minute and you'll find it at your left.

317. E: 我不过一个星期学汉语, 我早已知道多汉字。
Wo buguo yige xingqi xue hanyu, wo zao yi zhidao duo hanzi.
I not pass one week study Chinese, I early already know many Chinese characters
I have just studied Chinese for a week and I already know many Chinese characters.

C: 我学汉语不过一个星期, 我早已知道很多汉字。
Wo xue hanyu buguo yige xingqi, wo zao yi zhidao henduo hanzi.
I study Chinese not pass one week, I early already know many Chinese characters
I have just studied Chinese for a week and I already know many Chinese characters.

318. E: 我很多时间用了看中文录象和做中文练习。
Wo henduo shijian yong le kan zhongwen luxiang he zuo zhongwen lianxi.
I much time use LE see Chinese video and do Chinese exercise
I spent plenty of time watching Chinese video and doing Chinese exercises.

C: 我用了很多时间看中文录象和做中文练习。
Wo yong le henduo shijian kan zhongwen luxiang he zuo zhongwen lianxi.
I use LE much time see Chinese video and do Chinese exercise
I spent plenty of time watching Chinese video and doing Chinese exercises.

3.3.3 319. E: 我没看到你两年左右。
Wo mei kandao ni liangnian zuoyou.
I not see you two years about
I haven't seen you for about two years.

C: 我两年左右没看到你了。
Wo liangnian zuoyou mei kandao ni le.
I two years about not see you LE
I haven't seen you for about two years.

320. E: 我没见你多[很]长时间, 请一定来。
Wo mei jian ni hen chang shijian, qing yiding lai.
I not see you very long time, please definitely come
I haven't seen you for a long time, so please definitely come.

C: 我很长时间没见你了, 请一定来。
Wo hen chang shijian mei jian ni le, qing yiding lai.
I very long time not see you LE, please definitely come
I haven't seen you for a long time, so please definitely come.

321. E: 我们不[没]见面太长时间, 你好吗?
Women mei jianmian tai chang shijian, ni hao ma?
We not see face too long time, you good?
We haven't seen each other for a long time, how are you?

C: 我们太长时间没见面了, 你好吗?
Women tai chang shijian mei jianmian le, ni hao ma?
We too long time not see face LE, you good?
We haven't seen each other for a long time, how are you?

322. E: 我不看[没见]你两个年, 你一定来。
Wo mei jian ni liang ge nian, ni yiding lai.
I not see you two years, you definitely come
I haven't seen you for two years, so please definitely come.

C: 我两年没见你了, 你一定来。
Wo liang nian mei jian ni le, ni yiding lai.
I two years not see you LE, you definitely come
I haven't seen you for two years, so please definitely come.

323. E: 因为你回国一年半, 我们没见两年多了。
Yinwei ni huiguo yinianban, women mei jian liangnian duo le.
Because you back country one year half, we not see two year more LE.
We haven't seen each other for more than two years since you returned and stayed in your country for a year and a half.

C: 因为你回国一年半, 我们两年多没见了。
Yinwei ni huiguo yinianban, women liangnian duo mei jian le.
Because you back country one year half, we two year more not see LE.
We haven't seen each other for more than two years since you returned and stayed in your country for a year and a half.

3.4

324. E: 于是他就送那个照片给我。
Yushi ta jiu song nage zhaopian gei wo.
Therefore he just give that photo for me
Therefore, he gave that photo to me.

C: 于是他就送给我那个照片。
Yushi ta jiu song gei wo nage zhaopian.
Therefore he just give for me that photo
Therefore, he gave that photo to me.

325. E: (他喜欢我朋友), 每天他写[信]给我朋友。
Meitian ta xie xin gei wo pengyou.
Everyday ay he write letter for I friend
Every day he wrote to my friend.

C: 每天他给我朋友写信。
Meitian ta gei wo pengyou xie xin.
Every day he for I friend write letter
Every day he wrote to my friend.

326. E: 我在北京写这封信给你。
Wo zai Beijing xie zhe feng xin gei ni.
I in Beijing write this letter for you
I am writing this letter to you in Beijing.

C: 我在北京给你写这封信。
Wo zai Beijing gei ni xie zhe feng xin.
I in Beijing for you write this letter
I am writing this letter to you in Beijing.

327. E: 请不买我礼物, 因为我有东西太多了。
Qing bu mai wo liwu, yinwei wo you dongxi tai duo le.
Please not buy me gift, because I have things too many LE
Please do not buy me any gift because I have too many things.

C: 请不要给我买礼物, 因为我的东西太多了。
Qing bu yao gei wo mai liwu, yinwei wo de dongxi tai duo le.
Please not want for me buy gift, because my things too many LE
Please do not buy me any gift because I have too many things.

328. E: 如果你走错路, 请你电话给我的手机。
Ruguo ni zou cuo lu, qing ni dianhua gei wo de shouji.
If you walk wrong road, please you phone for my mobile
If you cannot find the way, please ring me on my mobile.

C: 如果你走错路, 请你给我打电话, 打手机。
Ruguo ni zou cuo lu, qing ni gei wo da dianhua, da shouji.
If you walk wrong road, please you for me call, call mobile
If you cannot find the way, please ring me on my mobile.

329. E: 我写你这封信, 因为我眼看十八岁。
Wo xie ni zhe feng xin, yinwei wo yan kan shi ba sui.
I write you this letter, because I eye see 18 years old
I am writing to you because my 18th birthday is coming up.

C: 我给你写这封信, 因为我眼看十八岁了。
Wo gei ni xie zhe feng xin, yinwei wo yan kan shi ba sui le.
I for you write this letter, because I eye see 18 years old LE
I am writing to you because my 18th birthday is coming up.

3.5.1 330. E: (我爱做作业), 父母觉得我一定是最好的孩子。
Fumu juede wo yiding shi zui hao de haizi.
Parents feel I definite is best child
(My) parents must think I am the best child.

C: 父母一定觉得我是最好的孩子。
Fumu yiding juede wo shi zui hao de haizi.
Parents definite feel I is best child
(My) parents must think I am the best child.

331. E: 我羡慕她很多[非常], [因为]她去北京旅游了。
Wo xianmu ta feichang, yinwei ta qu Beijing lüyou le.
I envy her a lot, because she go Beijing travel LE
I envy her a lot because she has gone traveling to Beijing.

C: 我非常羡慕她, 因为她去北京旅游了。
Wo feichang xianmu ta, yinwei ta qu Beijing luyou le.
I very much envy her, because she go Beijing travel LE
I envy her a lot because she has gone traveling to Beijing.

332. E: 我爱她很多。
Wo ai ta hen duo.
I love her very much
I love her very much.

C: 我很爱她。
Wo hen ai ta.
I very love her
I love her very much.

333. E: (我不去旅游, 因为我要做功课), 也我不想用多钱。
Ye wo bu xiang yong duo qian.
Also I not want use much money
I also do not want to use too much money.

C: 我也不想用太多钱。
Wo ye bu xiang yong tai duo qian.
I also not want use too much money
I also do not want to use too much money.

334. E: (那个苏格兰导游很爱他的家乡), 听他讲以后我们快也爱苏格兰了。
Ting ta jiang yihou women kuai ye ai Sugelan le.
Listen to him talk after we quickly also love Scotland LE
We also nearly fell in love with Scotland after listening to his talk.

C: 听他讲以后我们也快爱上苏格兰了。
Ting ta jiang yihou women ye kuai aishang Sugelan le.
Listen to him talk after we also quickly love up Scotland LE
We also nearly fell in love with Scotland after listening to his talk.

335. E: 现在的年轻人接吻到处。
Xianzai de nianqing ren jiewen daochu.
Now young people kiss everywhere
Now the youngsters can kiss anywhere.

C: 现在的年轻人到处接吻。
Xianzai de nianqing ren daochu jiewen.
Now young people everywhere kiss
Now the youngsters can kiss anywhere.

336. E: 第一天导游让我们起床起得很早。
Di yi tian daoyou rang women qichuang qi de hen zao.
The first day guide ask us get up get very early
On the first day the guide asked us to get up very early.

C: 第一天导游让我们很早起床。
Di yi tian daoyou rang women hen zao qichuang.
The first day guide ask us very early get up
On the first day the guide asked us to get up very early.

337. E: 欢迎来谈跟我一起天气。
Huanying lai tan gen wo yiqi tianqi.
Welcome come talk with me together weather
You are welcome to talk about the weather with me.

C: 欢迎跟我一起来谈天气。
Huanying gen wo yiqi lai tan tianqi.
Welcome with me together come talk weather
You are welcome to talk about the weather with me.

338. E: 越来越我们年龄大。
Yue lai yue women nianling da.
More and more we age big
We are getting older and older.

C: 我们年龄越来越大。
Women nianling yue lai yue da.
We age more and more big
We are getting older and older.

339. E: 请赐复很快地。
Qing ci fu hen kuai de.
Please reply soon
Please reply soon.

C: 请很快地赐复。
Qing hen kuai de ci fu.
Please soon reply
Please reply soon.

340. E: 我最想都我好朋友来到。
Wo zui xiang dou wo hao pengyou lai dao.
I most hope all I good friend come arrive
My greatest wish is that all my good friends come.

C: 我最想我好朋友都来到。
Wo zui xiang wo hao pengyou dou lai dao.
I most hope I good friend all come arrive
My greatest wish is that all my good friends come.

341. E: 我们必须和[喝]六瓶啤酒一起。
Women bixu he liu ping pijiu yiqi.
We must drink six bottle beer together
We must drink six bottles of beer together.

C: 我们必须一起喝六瓶啤酒。
Women bixu yiqi he liu ping pijiu.
We must together drink six bottle beer
We must drink six bottles of beer together.

342. E: 这是也好机会(看看另外的同学你从毕业以后没见)。
Zhe shi ye hao jihui
This is also good opportunity
This is also a good opportunity.

C: 这也是好机会。
Zhe ye shi hao jihui
This also is good opportunity
This is also a good opportunity.

343. E: 天气很好, 很阳光充足。
Tianqi hen hao, hen yangguang chongzu.
Weather very good, very sunny
The weather is very good and very sunny.

C: 天气很好, 阳光很充足。
Tianqi hen hao, yangguang hen chongzu.
Weather very good, sunny very
The weather is very good and very sunny.

344. E: 我们很累因为我们才晚上 十一点到旅馆。
Women henlei yinwei women cai wanshang shiyidian dao lüguan.
We very tired because we only night 11 hour arrive hotel
We were tired because we only arrived at our hotel at 11.00 pm.

C: 我们很累因为我们晚上十一点才到旅馆。
Women henlei yinwei women wanshang shiyidian cai dao lüguan.
We very tired because we night 11 hour only arrive hotel
We were tired because we only arrived at our hotel at 11.00 pm.

345. E: 还你要多练习舞蹈。
Hai ni yao duo lianxi wudao.
Still you want many practice dance
You still need more practice for your dancing.

C: 你还要多练习舞蹈。
Ni hai yao duo lianxi wudao.
You still want many practice dance
You still need more practice for your dancing.

346. E: 至于我的中文, 我必须学习努力。
Zhiyu wo de zhongwen, wo bixu xuexi nuli.
As for my Chinese, I must study hard
As for my Chinese, I must study hard.

C: 至于我的中文, 我必须努力学习。
Zhiyu wo de zhongwen, wo bixu nuli xuexi.
As for my Chinese, I must hard study
As for my Chinese, I must study hard.

3.5.2 347. E: 他比我一点儿高。
Ta bi wo yidianr gao.
He compare me a little tall
He is a little taller than I am.

C: 他比我高一点儿。
Ta bi wo gao yidianr.
He compare me tall a little
He is a little taller than I am.

348. E: 我学很好地质学。
Wo xue hen hao dizhixue.
I study very well geology
I have studied geology and I did very well.

C: 我学地质学学得很好。
Wo xue dizhixue xue de hen hao.
I study geology study very well
I have studied geology and I did very well.

349. E: 上次事故他没有很严重地受伤。
Shang ci shigu ta meiyou hen yanzhong de shou le shang.
Last time accident he not have very seriously hurt
In the last accident he was hurt, though not very seriously.

C: 上次事故他受伤伤得不严重。
Shang ci shigu ta shoushang shang de bu yanzhong.
Last time accident he receive hurt hurt not seriously
In the last accident he was hurt, though not very seriously.

350. E: 我朋友学中文, 他写好看的汉字。
Wo pengyou xue zhongwen, ta xie hao kan de hanzi.
I friend study Chinese, he write good-looking character
My friend studies Chinese and he writes good-looking characters.

C: 我朋友学中文, 他汉字写得很好看。
Wo pengyou xue zhongwen, ta hanzi xie de hen hao kan.
I friend study Chinese, he character write *de* good-looking
My friend studies Chinese and he writes good-looking characters.

351. E: 那个电影太好看了, 她哭了因为感动。
Nage dianying tai hao kan le, ta ku le yinwei gandong.
That film too good LE, she cry LE because moved
That film was so good that she was moved to tears.

C: 那个电影太好看了, 她感动得哭了。
Nage dianying tai hao kan le, ta gandong de ku le.
That film too good LE, she moved *de* cry LE
That film was so good that she was moved to tears.

352. E: 我很激动不能睡着, 因为我要去北京了。
Wo hen jidong bu neng shuizhao, yinwei wo yao qu Beijing le.
I very excited not can sleep, because I will go Beijing LE
I am too excited to sleep because I am going to Beijing.

C: 我激动得睡不着, 因为我要去北京了。
Wo jidong de shui bu zhao, yinwei wo yao qu Beijing le.
I excited *de* sleep not well, because I will go Beijing LE
I am too excited to sleep because I am going to Beijing.

353. E: 我有考试的时候我不能睡好[睡不好]。
Wo you kaoshi de shihou wo bun eng shui hao.
I have exam time I not can sleep well
I cannot sleep well when I have an exam.

C: 我有考试的时候睡不好。
Wo you kaoshi de shihou shui bu hao.
I have exam time I sleep not well
I cannot sleep well when I have an exam.

354. E: 中学的中文比大学很容易 。
Zhongxue de zhongwen bi daxue hen rongyi.
High school Chinese compare university very easy
The Chinese in high school is much easier than that in the university.

C: 中学的中文比大学容易很多。
Zhongxue de zhongwen bi daxue rongyi hen duo.
High school Chinese compare university easy a lot
The Chinese in high school is much easier than that in the university.

3.6

355. E: 我不去旅游, 因为我要做功课。
Wo bu qu lüyou, yinwei wo yao zuo gongke.
I not go traveling, because I want do study
I don't go traveling because I would like to study my lessons.

C: 因为我要做功课, 我不去旅游。
Yinwei wo yao zuo gongke, wo bu qu lüyou.
Because I want do study, I not go traveling,
I don't go traveling because I would like to study my lessons.

356. E: 我夫人买了磁带, 她喜欢中国音乐。
Wo furen mai le cidai, ta xihuan Zhongguo yinyue.
I wife buy LE cassette tape, she like Chinese music
My wife bought a cassette tape because she likes Chinese music.

C: 我夫人喜欢中国音乐, 她买了磁带。
Wo furen xihuan Zhongguo yinyue, ta mai le cidai.
I wife like Chinese music, she buy LE cassette tape
My wife bought a cassette tape because she likes Chinese music.

357. E: 我们决定去海边因为喜欢游泳。
Women jueding qu haibian yinwei xihuan youyong.
We decide go beach because like swimming
We have decided to go the beach because we like swimming.

C: 因为喜欢游泳, 我们决定去海边。
Yinwei xihuan youyong women jueding qu haibian.
Because like swimming we decide go beach
We have decided to go the beach because we like swimming.

358. E: 我很羡慕她, 她要去北京旅游了。
Wo hen xianmu ta, ta yao qu Beijing lüyou le.
I very envy her, she will go Beijing traveling
I envy her very much (because) she is going traveling to Beijing.

C: 她要去北京旅游了, 我很羡慕她。
Ta yao qu Beijing lüyou le, wo hen xianmu ta.
She will go Beijing traveling, I very envy her,
I envy her very much (because) she is going traveling to Beijing.

359. E: 我不能去欧洲旅游, 因为我没有钱。
Wo bu neng qu Europe *lüyou, yinwei wo meiyou qian*.
I not can go Europe travel, because I not have money
I can not go traveling to Europe because I don't have any money.

C: 因为我没有钱, 我不能去欧洲旅游。
Yinwei wo meiyou qian, wo bu neng qu Ouzhou lüyou.
Because I not have money, I not can go Europe travel
I can not go traveling to Europe because I don't have any money.

360. E: 我很激动睡不着, 因为我要去旅游了。
Wo hen jidong shui bu zhao, yinwei wo yao qu lüyou le.
I very excited sleep not well, because I will go travel LE
I am too excited to sleep because I am going to go traveling.

C: 因为我要去旅游了, 我很激动睡不着。
Yinwei wo yao qu lüyou l, wo hen jidong shui bu zhao.
Because I will go travel LE, I very excited sleep not well
I am too excited to sleep because I am going to go traveling.

361. E: 应该很容易找到, 因为我的房子是红色的。
Yinggai hen rongyi zhaodao, yinwei wo de fangzi shi hongse de.
Should very easy find, because my house is red
It should be easy to find my house because it is red.

C: 因为我的房子是红色的, 应该很容易找到。
Yinwei wo de fangzi shi hongse de, yinggai hen rongyi zhaodao.
Because my house is red, should very easy find
It should be easy to find my house because it is red.

362. E: 我一定要喝酒, 因为我是[已经]十八岁。
Wo yiding yao he jiu, yinwei wo yijing shiba sui.
I definite want drink wine, because I already eighteen
I'll definitely have some wine because I am already eighteen.

C: 因为我已经十八岁, 我一定要喝酒。
Yinwei wo yijing shiba sui, wo yiding yao he jiu.
Because I already eighteen, I definite want drink wine
I'll definitely have some wine because I am already eighteen.

363. E: 他尝试找我的电话号码, 当他在出国[国外]读书[时]。
Ta changshi zhao wo de dianhua haoma, dang ta zai guo wai dushu shi.
He attempt find my telephone number, when he at overseas study
He tried to find my telephone number while he was studying overseas.

C: 当他在国外读书时, 他试图找我的电话号码。
Dang ta zai guowai dushu shi, ta shitu zhao wo de dianhua haoma.
When he at overseas study he try find my telephone number,
He tried to find my telephone number while he was studying overseas.

364. E: 我写你[给你写]这封信, 因为我眼看十八岁。
Wo gei ni xie zhe feng xin, yinwei wo yan kan shiba sui.
I for you write this letter, because I eye see eighteen
I am writing this letter to you because I am turning eighteen soon.

C: 因为我眼看十八岁, 所以我给你写这封信。
Yinwei wo yan kan shiba sui, suoyi wo gei ni xie zhe feng xin.
Because I eye see eighteen, so I for you write this letter
I am writing this letter to you because I am turning eighteen soon.

365. E: 会让我很高兴如果你来。
Hui rang wo hen gaoxing ruguo ni lai.
Can make me very happy if you come
It would make me very happy if you could come.

C: 如果能你来会让我很高兴。
Ruguo ni neng lai hui rang wo hen gaoxing.
If you can come will make me very happy
It would make me very happy if you could come.

366. E: 我们看见很多老人跑步, 我们参观公园的时候。
Women kanjian henduo laoren paobu, women canguan gongyuan de shihou.
We see many old people jog, we visit park time
We saw many elderly people jogging when we visited parks.

C: 我们参观公园的时候看见很多老人跑步。
Women canguan gongyuan de shihou kanjian henduo laoren paobu.
We visit park time see many old people jog
We saw many elderly people jogging when we visited parks.

4.1 367. E: 我五次每个年平均去看电影。
Wo wuci mei ge nian pingjun qu kan dianying.
I five times every year average go see film
I go to see a film five times every year on average.

C: 我平均每年去看五次电影。
Wo pingjun mei nian qu kan wuci dianying.
I average every year go see five times film
I go to see a film five times every year on average.

368. E: 我平均七个小时每天睡觉。
Wo pingjun qige xiaoshi meitian shuijiao.
I average 7 hour every day sleep
I sleep for seven hours on average every day.

C: 我平均每天睡觉七个小时。
Wo pingjun meitian shuijiao qige xiaoshi.
I average every day sleep 7 hour
I sleep for seven hours on average every day.

369. E: 我会做三十小时的运动每个星期。
Wo hui zuo sanshi ge xiaoshi de yundong mei xingqi.
I will do 30 hour *de* exercise every week
I normally do exercises for thirty-hours every week.

C: 我 每个星期会做三十小时的运动。
Wo mei xingqi hui zuo sanshi ge xiaoshi de yundong.
I every week will do 30 hour *de* exercise
I normally do exercises for thirty-hours every week.

370. E: 我的家庭作业是[需要]四个小时每天。
Wo de jiating zuoye xuyao si ge xiaoshi meitian.
My homework need four hours everyday
My homework requires four hours of work everyday.

C: 我的家庭作业每天需要四个小时。
Wo de jiating zuoye meitian xuyao si ge xiaoshi.
My homework everyday need four hours
My homework requires four hours of work everyday.

371. E: 他刚刚上礼拜从巴西回来。
Ta ganggang shang libai cong Baxi hui lai.
He just last week from Brazil back come
He has just come back from Brazil last week.

C: 他上礼拜刚刚从巴西回来。
Ta shang libai ganggang cong Baxi hui lai.
He last week just from Brazil back come
He has just come back from Brazil last week.

372. E: 晚会开始在前后八点和完在你睡觉的时候。
Wanhui kaishi zai qianhou ba dian he wan zai ni shuijiao de shihou.
Party start at about 8 and finish at you sleep *de* time
The party will start at about 8 and finish at the time when you normally go to bed.

C: 晚会八点前后开始, 在你通常睡觉时结束。
Wanhui ba dian qianhou kaishi, zai ni tongchang shuijiao shi jieshu.
Party 8 about start, at you normally sleep time finish
The party will start at about 8 and finish at the time when you normally go to bed.

373. E: 我七个小时每天平均睡觉。
Wo qi ge xiaoshi meitian pingjun shuijiao.
I seven hours every day average sleep
I sleep seven hours on average every day.

C: 我平均每天睡七个小时。
Wo pingjun meitian shui qi ge xiaoshi.
I average every day sleep seven hours
I sleep seven hours on average every day.

374. E: 离开布里斯本有多两年了。
Likai Bulisiben you duo liangnian le.
Leave Brisbane have more two year LE
It has been more than two years since I left Brisbane.

C: 离开布里斯本有两年多了。
Likai Bulisiben you liangnian duo le.
Leave Brisbane have two year more LE
It has been more than two years since I left Brisbane.

375. E: 十一月上[去]年一考试结束, 我们就做飞机去欧洲了。
Shiyiyue qu nian yi kaoshi jieshu, women jiu zuo feiji qu Ouzhou le.
November last year exam finish, we just sit plane go Europe LE
In November last year we went to Europe by air immediately after finishing the exam.

C: 去年十一月考试一结束, 我们就做飞机去欧洲了。
Qu nian shiyiyue kaoshi yi jieshu, women jiu zuo feiji qu Ouzhou le.
Last year November exam finish, we just sit plane go Europe LE
In November last year we went to Europe by air immediately after finishing the exam.

376. E: 四月一号七点早上我就到了。
Siyue yihao qidian zaoshang wo jiu dao le.
April first 7.00 morning I just arrive LE
I arrived at 7.00 in the morning on the first of April.

C: 四月一号早上七点我就到了。
Siyue yihao zaoshang qidian wo jiu dao le.
April first morning 7.00 I just arrive LE
I arrived at 7.00 in the morning on the first of April.

377. E: 我是6号七月下午到北京的。
Wo shi liu hao qiyue xiawu dao Beijing de.
I am 6 July afternoon arrive Beijing *de*
It was on the afternoon of the 6th July that I arrived in Beijing.

C: 我是七月6号下午到北京的。
Wo shi qiyue liu hao xiawu dao Beijing de.
I am July 6 afternoon arrive Beijing *de*
It was on the afternoon of the 6th July that I arrived in Beijing.

4.2 378. E: 我的住址是123号 Simpson 街。
Wo de zhuzhi shi 123 hao Simpson Jie.
My address is 123 number Simpson Street
My address is No. 123, Simpson Street.

C: 我的住址是 Simpson 街123号。
Wo de zhuzhi shi Simpson Jie 123 hao.
My address is Simpson Street 123 number
My address is No. 123, Simpson Street.

379. E: 我住址是37号 Gawalla 路。
Wo zhuzhi shi 37 hao Gawalla Lu.
My address is 37 number Gawalla Road
My address is No. 37 Gawalla Road.

C: 我住址是 Gawalla 路37号。
Wo zhuzhi shi Gawalla Lu 37 hao.
My address is Gawalla Road 37 number
My address is No. 37 Gawalla Road.

380. E: 我的地址是六十六号 Ironside 街 St. Lucia 区。
Wo de dizhi shi liushiliu hao Ironside Jie St. Lucia qu.
My address is 66 number Ironside Street, St. Lucia district
My address is No. 66, Ironside Street, St. Lucia district.

C: 我的地址是 St. Lucia 区 Ironside 街六十六号。
Wo de dizhi shi St. Lucia qu Ironside Jie liushiliu hao.
My address is St. Lucia district Ironside Street, 66 number
My address is No. 66, Ironside Street, St. Lucia district.

381. E: 我住在114号 Severne Street。
Wo zhu zai yiyisi hao Severne Jie.
I live at 114 number Severne Street
I live at No. 114, Severne Street.

C: 我住在 Severne 街114号。
Wo zhu zai Severne Jie yiyisi hao.
I live at Severne Street 114 number
I live at No. 114, Severne Street.

382. E: 我的地址是37号 Jainba 街, Indooroopilly。
Wo de dizhi shi sanshiqi hao Jainba Jie, Indooroopilly.
My address is 37 number Jainba Street, Indooroopilly
My address is No. 37, Jainba Street, Indooroopilly.

C: 我的地址是 Indooroopilly 区 Jainba 街37号。
Wo de dizhi shi Indooroopilly qu Jainba Jie sanshiqi hao.
My address is Indooroopilly district Jainba Street 37 number
My address is No. 37, Jainba Street, Indooroopilly.

383. E: 我的住址是三十六号 James 街。
Wo de zhuzhi shi sanshiliu hao James Jie.
My address is 36 number James Street
My address is No. 36, James Street.

C: 我的住址是 James 街三十六号。
Wo de zhuzhi shi James Jie sanshiliu hao.
My address is James Street 36 number
My address is No. 36, James Street.

384. E: 我住在 St. Lucia, 在三号 Cascade 路。
Wo zhu zai St. Lucia, zai san hao Cascade Lu.
I live in St. Lucia, at 3 number Cascade Road
I live in St. Lucia, at No. 3, Cascade Road.

C: 我住在 St. Lucia, 在 Cascade 路三号。
Wo zhu zai St. Lucia, zai Cascade Lu san hao.
I live in St. Lucia, at Cascade Road 3 number
I live in St. Lucia, at No. 3, Cascade Road.

385. E: 我地址是四号 Smith 街, Paddington。
Wo dizhi shi si hao Smith Jie, Paddington.
I address is 4 number Smith Street, Paddington
My address is No. 4, Smith Street, Paddington.

C: 我的地址是 Paddington 区 Smith 街四号。
Wo dizhi shi Paddington qu Smith Jie si hao.
I address is Paddington district Smith Street 4 number
My address is No. 4, Smith Street, Paddington.

386. E: 我的家门牌号是"18号, 外国街, 布里斯本"。
Wo de jia menpaihao shi "shiba hao, Waiguo Jie, Bulisiben"
My home address is "18 number, Foreign country St., Brisbane"
My home address is No. 18, Foreign country St., Brisbane.

C: 我的家门牌号是"布里斯本外国街18号"。
Wo de jia menpaihao shi "Bulisiben Waiguo Jie shiba hao"
My home address is "18 number, Foreign country St., Brisbane"
My home address is No. 18, Foreign country St., Brisbane.

387. E: 除了长城以外, 故宫是我在北京中国最喜欢的地方。
Chu le Changcheng yiwai, Gugong is wo zai Beijing Zhongguo zui xihuan de difang.
Besides the Great Wall, Forbidden City is I in *Beijing* China most like *de* place
Besides the Great Wall, the Forbidden City is the place I like most in Beijing, China.

C: 除了长城以外, 故宫是我在中国北京最喜欢的地方。
Chu le Changcheng yiwai, Gugong is wo zai Zhongguo Beijing zui xihuan de difang.
Besides the Great Wall, Forbidden City is I in China *Beijing* most like *de* place
Besides the Great Wall, the Forbidden City is the place I like most in Beijing, China.

388. E: 从上边长城我看到漂亮风景。
Cong shangbian Changcheng wo kan dao piaoliang fengjing.
From top the Great Wall I see beautiful scenery
I saw beautiful scenery from the top of the Great Wall.

C: 从长城上边我看到漂亮风景。
Cong Changcheng shangbian wo kan dao piaoliang fengjing.
From the Great Wall top I see beautiful scenery
I saw beautiful scenery from the top of the Great Wall.

389. E: 我们的宾馆在十九房二楼关山路, 西安。
Women de binguan zai shijiu fang er lou Guanshan Lu, Xi'an.
Our guest house at 19 Room 2 level Guanshan Road, Xi'an
Our guesthouse was at Guanshan Road, Xi'an and we stayed in Room 19, level 2.

C: 我们的宾馆在西安关山路, 我们住二楼十九房。
Women de binguan zai Xian Guanshan Lu, women zhu er lou shijiu fang.
Our guest house at Xi'an Guanshan Road, we stay 2 level 19 Room
Our guesthouse was at Guanshan Road, Xi'an and we stayed in Room 19, level 2.

4.3 390. E: 在前大门上午十一点我们见面。
Zai qian damen shangwu shiyidian women jianmian.
At front gate morning 11.00 we see each other
We'll see each other at 11.00 am at the front gate.

C: 我们上午十一点在前大门见面。
Women shangwu shiyidian zai qian damen jianmian.
We morning 11.00 at front gate see each other
We'll see each other at 11.00 am at the front gate.

391. E: 生日会在五月六日六点举行在我的家。
Shengrihui zai wuyue liu ri liu dian juxing zai wo de jia.
Birthday party at may 6 6.00 hold at my home
The birthday party will be held in my home at 6.00 on 6th May.

C: 生日会于五月六日六点在我家举行。
Shengrihui yu wuyue liu ri liu dian zai wo jia juxing.
Birthday party at may 6 6.00 at my home hold
The birthday party will be held in my home at 6.00 on 6th May.

392. E: 星期六晚七点晚会开始[举办]在我家。
Xingqiliu wan qi dian wanhui juban zai wo jia.
Saturday late 7.00 party start at my home
The party will be held at 7.00 pm on Saturday in my home.

C: 晚会星期六晚七点在我家举办。
Wanhui xingqiliu wan qi dian zai wo jia juban.
Saturday late 7.00 party start at my home
The party will be held at 7.00 pm on Saturday in my home.

393. E: 他下个星期天结婚在教堂。
Ta xia ge xingqitian jiehun zai jiaotang.
He next Sunday marry at church
He is getting married at a church next Sunday.

C: 他下个星期天在教堂结婚。
Ta xia ge xingqitian zai jiaotang jiehun.
He next Sunday at church marry
He is getting married at a church next Sunday.

394. E: 我朋友读英文大声地在房子里每天。
Wo pengyou du yingwen dasheng de zai fangzili meitian.
I friend read English loudly in house inside everyday
My friend reads English loudly in the house every day.

C: 我朋友每天在房子里大声地读英文。
Wo pengyou meitian zai fangzili dasheng de du yingwen.
I friend everyday in house inside loudly read English
My friend reads English loudly in the house every day.

4.4 395. E: 这本书非常流行, 有九个在十个人中读过它。
Zhe ben shu feichang liuxing, you jiu ge zai shi ge ren zhong du guo ta.
This book very popular, have nine among ten people read it
This book is so popular that nine out of ten people have read it.

C: 这本书非常流行, 十个人中有九个读过它。
Zhe ben shu feichang liuxing, shi ge ren zhong you jiu ge du guo ta.
This book very popular, ten people among have nine read it
This book is so popular that nine out of ten people have read it.

396. E: 我的朋友两个学日文三个学中文。
Wo de pengyou liang ge xue riwen san ge xue zhongwen.
My friend two study Japanese three study Chinese
Among my friends, two study Japanese and three study Chinese.

C: 我的朋友三个学中文两个学日文。
Wo de pengyou san ge xue zhongwen liang ge xue riwen.
My friend three study Chinese two study Japanese
Among my friends, two study Japanese and three study Chinese.

5. 397. E: 可是很多孩子在中国不想学习。
Keshi henduo haizi zai Zhongguo bu xiang xuexi.
However many children in China not want study
However, many children in China do not want to study.

C: 可是在中国很多孩子不想学习。
Keshi zai Zhongguo henduo haizi bu xiang xuexi.
However in China many children not want study
However, many children in China do not want to study.

6. No word order error was found in this category.

7. 398. E: 很重要找好的工作。
Hen zhongyao zhao hao de gongzuo.
Very important find good job
It is very important to find a good job.

C: 找一份好的工作很重要。
Zhao yifen hao de gongzuo hen zhongyao.
Find a good job very important
It is very important to find a good job.

399. E: 有一个钟楼离我的房子不远。
You yige zhonglou li wo de fangzi bu yuan.
Have a clochard from my house not far
There is a clochard not far from my house.

C: 离我的房子不远处有一个钟楼。
Li wo de fangzi bu yuan chu you yige zhonglou.
From my house not far place have a clochard
There is a clochard not far from my house.

400. E: 我很激动见面[到]我的老朋友。
Wo hen jidong jiandao wo de lao pengyou.
I very excited see my old friend
I am very excited to see my old friends.

C: 见到老朋友我很激动。
Jiandao lao pengyou, wo hen jidong.
See old friend, I very excited
I am very excited to see my old friends.

401. E: 会让我很高兴如果你来。
Hui rang wo hen gaoxing ruguo ni lai.
Will make me very happy if you come
I'll be very happy if you come.

C: 如果你来会让我很高兴。
Ruguo ni lai hui rang wo hen gaoxing.
If you come will make me very happy
I'll be very happy if you come.

402. E: 比较安全把钱放在银行。
Bijiao anquan ba qian fang zai yinhang.
Comparatively safe BA money put in bank
It is comparatively safe to put money in the bank.

C: 把钱放在银行比较安全。
Ba qian fang zai yinhang bijiao anquan.
BA money put in bank comparatively safe
It is comparatively safe to put money in the bank.

403. E: 很要紧在北京的时候去看长城。
Hen yaojin zai Beijing de shihou qu kan Changcheng.
Very important in Beijing *de* time go see the Great Wall
It is very important to go and visit the Great Wall while you are in Beijing.

C: 在北京的时候去看长城很必要。
Zai Beijing de shihou qu kan Changcheng en biyao.
In Beijing *de* time go see the Great Wall very important
It is very important to go and visit the Great Wall while you are in Beijing.

404. E: 我想很幸运有一个很有钱的朋友。
Wo xiang hen xingyun you yi ge hen you qian de pengyou.
I think very lucky have a very wealthy friend
I think it is very lucky for a person to have a very wealthy friend.

C: 我想有一个很有钱的朋友很幸运。
Wo xiang you yi ge hen you qian de pengyou hen xingyun.
I think have a very wealthy friend very lucky
I think it is very lucky for a person to have a very wealthy friend.

405. E: 我学中文三年了, 我有困难看中文。
Wo xue zhongwen sannian le, wo you kunnan kan zhongwen.
I study Chinese three years LE, I have difficulty read Chinese
I have studied Chinese for three years and I still have difficulty in reading Chinese.

C: 我学中文三年了, 看中文还是有困难。
Wo xue zhongwen sannian le, kan zhongwen haishi you kunnan.
I study Chinese three years LE, read Chinese still have difficulty
I have studied Chinese for three years and I still have difficulty in reading Chinese.

406. E: 我有不够时间买东西。
Wo you bu gou shijian mai dongxi.
I have not enough time buy things
I don't have enough time for shopping.

C: 我买东西的时间不够。
Wo mai dongxi de shijian bu gou.
I buy things *de* time not enough
I don't have enough time for shopping.

407. E: 我不工作, 没有足够钱, 所以我有少的衣服。
Wo bu gongzuo, mei you zugou qian, suoyi wo you shao de yifu.
I not work, not have enough money, therefore I have few clothes
I don't work and don't have enough money; therefore, I have few clothes.

C: 我不工作, 没有太多钱, 所以我的衣服很少。
Wo bu gongzuo, mei you taiduo qian, suoyi wo de yifu hen shao.
I not work, not have much money, therefore my clothes very few
I don't work and don't have much money, therefore, I have few clothes.

8. 408. E: 我记得我们的聚会, 太大, 太嘈杂和太晚。
Wo jide women de juhui, tai da, tai caoza he tai wan.
I remember our party, too big, too noisy and too late
I remember our parties: so many people, so loud and so late.

C: 我记得我们的聚会, 人很多, 声音很大, 结束很晚。
Wo jide women de juhui, tai da, tai caoza he tai wan.
I remember our party, too big, too noisy and too late
I remember our parties: so many people, so loud and so late.

9. No word order error was found in this category.

10. No word order error was found in this category.

Subject Index

absence 161
acquisition 1, 2, 11, 12, 14–17, 19–27, 29–41, 44, 46, 55–58, 60–62, 64, 65, 69, 70, 76, 109, 111–114, 117, 119, 124, 129, 142, 186, 196, 201, 203, 204, 207, 208
agent 3, 39, 40–45, 55, 66, 67, 81, 93, 159
analysis 17, 20, 30, 36, 37, 59, 67, 70, 71, 112, 113, 127, 131, 133, 135, 138–143, 147, 148, 188, 196, 198, 207
animacy 39–42, 44, 45
approach 16, 45–47, 50, 54, 56, 57, 107, 142, 143, 178, 179, 180, 183, 189, 198, 200, 209
aspect 2, 5, 24, 25, 28, 33, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 64, 118, 164, 200
assumption 23, 26, 27, 33, 39, 40, 118, 125

branching 7, 9, 11, 12, 103

canonical word order (CWO) 7
categorization 17, 48, 50–52, 54, 56, 57, 66, 68, 69, 72, 74, 84–86, 108, 111, 129, 142, 147–149, 178, 179, 183, 200
centrality 3
character 1, 4, 8, 12, 20, 30, 33, 41, 47, 51, 62, 65–67, 86–89, 112, 114, 121, 122, 131, 135, 137, 138, 142, 155, 162, 177, 178, 180, 183, 185, 242, 188, 190, 192, 195, 197
Chinese grammar 1, 3, 46, 47, 54, 70, 82, 87, 89
classification 14, 15, 51, 75, 85, 127, 140, 142
clause 2, 4, 7, 11, 12, 33–36, 63, 65, 67, 74, 93, 94, 97, 102, 103, 139, 160, 193, 194
cognition 3, 6, 26, 45–48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57, 135
coherence 82, 83, 138
communicative 14, 39, 46, 83, 97, 98, 100, 102, 121, 123, 206
Communicative Dynamism (CD) 97
compensate 4
competence 19, 20, 22, 24–26, 31, 39, 125, 130
competent 137, 191, 196, 197, 205, 206
competition 41, 43, 106, 107, 202, 203
Competition Model (CD) 16, 23, 32, 39, 44
complexity 6, 33, 34, 36, 53, 55, 139, 186, 194, 196, 207
complicated 1, 2, 6, 12, 38, 44, 61, 188–190, 193, 196, 197, 206
components 2
conceptualization 6, 22, 45, 47–50, 54, 56, 57, 75, 107, 130, 175, 178, 180, 189, 190, 194, 197, 198, 200, 206
constraint 7, 10
context 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 22, 30, 39, 63–69, 76, 80, 81, 84, 94, 107, 113, 116, 118, 119, 121, 122, 124–126, 136, 147, 170
continuation 138
continuum 9, 107
controversial 25, 30, 31
cross-linguistic 6, 7
cross-sectional 17, 111–115, 133, 202, 207

debate 8, 25, 82, 153
definite
–indefinite 5, 6, 8, 153, 161
definiteness 5, 6
description 14–17, 23, 74, 81, 96, 111, 115, 121, 123, 126–128, 133, 138, 139, 149, 179, 183, 198, 199, 201
descriptive 13, 34, 112, 113
device 2–5, 15, 63, 80, 97, 122, 124

difference 2, 4–6, 11, 12, 19, 21, 25, 26, 31, 39, 40, 46–48, 50, 56, 57, 62, 67, 73, 87, 89–91, 93, 99, 100, 102, 115, 117, 121, 123, 130, 147, 149, 163, 196
difficulty 13, 19, 29, 64, 67, 72, 118, 155, 179, 185, 189, 191, 194, 205, 206
discourse 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 29, 30, 37, 38, 47, 58, 63, 64, 65, 67–69, 80, 82, 85, 124, 127, 139, 159
discourse-oriented 11, 37
distinction 18–20, 92, 125, 126, 139

empirical studies 1, 36, 44, 209
ending 2, 11, 51, 52, 90, 147
English-speaking 2, 6, 10, 12–14, 16, 43, 54, 56, 57, 61, 63, 65, 96, 135, 137, 138, 159, 202
enhance 15, 44, 120, 142, 148, 183, 209
environment 19, 25, 47, 87, 114
essential 2, 10, 26, 46, 155
establishment 15, 199

feature 2, 3, 6–8, 10–12, 19, 21, 24, 33, 38, 45, 59– 63, 120, 122, 123, 125, 129, 130, 139, 159, 179, 203
first language 18, 19, 22, 24, 25, 117, 129
flexibility 52, 54, 56, 159
fluency 13, 131
focus 1, 19, 26, 31, 32, 34, 42, 46, 58, 61, 67, 69, 97–102, 116–118, 122, 139, 147, 154, 156–158, 203, 204, 207, 208
foreign language 1, 2, 13, 17–19, 60, 70, 118, 207
frequency 8, 113, 175, 183, 184, 190
frequent 8, 13, 14, 18, 20, 87, 146, 184, 188
function 5, 16, 23, 45–48, 50–52, 54, 56, 57, 84–87, 97, 107, 109, 130, 142, 143, 145, 150, 159, 177, 178, 179, 180, 183, 242, 188, 189, 191, 198, 200, 209
grammatical 3, 5, 7, 9–11, 13, 22, 25, 26, 28–37, 40, 44, 46–48, 55–57, 63, 65, 67, 69, 80–83, 102, 103, 106, 107, 124–126, 133, 139, 140, 150, 152–155, 160, 161, 170, 181, 182, 188, 189, 191, 193, 197, 204–206, 209
grammaticalization 106, 107

GWO 7, 10, 11, 12

hypothesis 25, 26, 28, 29, 61

iconicity 48, 53, 54, 56, 57, 82, 87, 103, 178
inability 68, 69, 137
inappropriate 10, 13, 22, 63–65, 67, 68, 76, 80, 81, 119, 124, 125, 126, 131, 133, 140, 153, 170
indeterminacy 30, 31
influence 6, 10, 20, 21, 38, 40, 60, 67, 113, 120, 127, 129, 130, 132, 133, 147, 158, 175
information structuring 2–5
input 21, 24, 26, 44, 113, 117
instruction 13–15, 25, 26, 129, 167, 180, 182, 183, 192, 203–205, 207, 209
intake 21, 44
intangible 163
interlanguage 21, 22, 32, 43, 59, 61, 65, 68–70, 76, 115–119, 121, 123
interprete 3, 6, 41–44, 46, 100, 102, 107, 113, 114, 124, 126, 140, 148
inter-rater reliability 126, 140, 148

learners of Chinese 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 43, 56, 57, 62, 72, 135, 137, 140, 146, 158, 160, 180, 196, 200, 202, 207
learning 19, 58
lexical 8, 13, 19, 30, 33, 36, 39, 49, 50, 51, 63, 70, 120, 206, 208
linear 2, 5, 53, 54, 83
linguist 2, 6–9, 11, 13, 15, 20–25, 29, 31–33, 39, 43–47, 50, 51, 53–55, 58, 68, 77, 84, 87, 96, 97, 106, 112, 114, 117, 118, 123, 126–129, 130, 139, 161, 165, 178, 179, 193, 200
linguistic studies 2, 15, 84

manifest 8, 21, 24, 32, 54, 55, 82, 87, 95, 97, 115, 121, 132, 153
mental 20, 30, 31–38, 40, 45, 46, 55, 58, 61, 62, 67, 112, 113, 130, 131, 148, 193, 207

methodology 17, 38, 55, 58, 61, 65, 69, 109, 111, 115, 116, 119, 120, 126, 133, 208
Minimalist program 31
modifier 8, 11, 12, 74, 75, 92, 99, 102, 103, 160, 161, 174, 182, 193, 194
morphology 3, 36, 54, 82, 128, 208
mother tongue 18

native language (NL) 18, 116
negation 4, 28, 29, 71, 172, 173
noun 3–7, 12, 24, 27, 28, 39–42, 44, 45, 50–54, 56, 58, 59, 61, 63, 66, 74, 76, 79, 80, 90, 102, 103, 106, 122, 131, 156, 159–162, 164, 182

omnipresent 163
ordering 5, 6, 11, 12, 86, 89, 94, 95, 98, 102, 127
overview 16

parameters 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31
patient 3, 39– 42, 66, 67
paucity 1
performance 20
politeness 11, 104
powerful 4, 50
prerequisite 15, 32, 36, 126, 127, 199, 205
presence 161
problematic 14, 19, 22, 25, 55, 56, 72, 74, 75, 129, 193, 194, 196, 197, 204–206
procedure 17, 32–34, 55, 115, 133, 135, 139, 140, 142
Processability Theory 16, 23, 32, 36, 37, 61, 186
pro-drop 24, 27, 28, 30
proficiency 20, 29–31, 42, 43, 61, 66, 112, 114, 120, 133, 135–140, 147, 149, 179, 184–186, 188–197, 202–206
prominence 7, 9, 58
propose 8, 15, 24, 25, 39, 40, 47, 76, 87, 107, 109, 111, 129, 132, 133, 135, 139, 142–144, 147, 153, 177, 204, 207, 209
punctual time 91, 170
PWO 7, 10, 11, 12, 37

rearrangement 4, 88
relationship 10, 38, 41, 42, 47–50, 53, 54, 56, 66, 67, 77–79, 90, 94, 97, 104, 161, 162, 179, 183, 200–202
represent 2, 11, 36, 77, 78, 81, 91, 97, 139, 169–172, 181
resemblance 50, 51
role 3

second language 18
sentence processing 39–41, 44
sentence-oriented 11
sequence 2, 8, 10, 32, 34–38, 48, 53, 55, 58, 61, 62, 77, 83, 88, 89, 92–94, 104–106, 138, 152, 163–165, 189, 204, 206, 207, 209
similarity 6, 21, 117
SLA 1, 2, 6, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 31, 33, 36, 37, 43, 55, 69, 70, 111–113, 115, 117, 118, 129, 180, 201
sociocentrism 105
SOV 7, 8, 12, 29, 35, 153, 154
speech 18, 31, 34, 50, 53, 59, 69, 112, 113, 114, 120, 146
subject-prominent 9–12, 75
subjunctive 3, 4, 11
sub-principle 16, 81, 84–86, 89–95, 106–109, 111, 124, 126, 129, 131, 133, 135, 139, 140–145, 147–149, 151, 152, 155, 158–176, 178–183, 185, 192–201, 205, 206, 208
summarize 5, 7, 35, 75, 82, 84–86, 112, 119–121, 126, 138, 144, 153, 198
SVO 7, 8, 12, 34–36, 54, 56, 62, 83, 153–155, 160, 193
syllable 4, 5
syntactic 3, 5, 7–10, 13, 28, 34, 37–41, 46, 48, 50, 52–56, 70, 72, 82, 85, 87, 89, 91, 95, 102, 103, 107, 120, 122, 123, 139, 153, 165, 171, 188, 193, 196, 204, 208
syntax 1–3, 28, 36, 53, 100, 127, 128, 139, 161

temporal 2, 48–50, 54, 56, 66, 67, 72, 73, 77, 78, 81, 87, 88, 90, 91, 95, 103, 165, 169, 170–172, 181
tense 2, 3, 5, 22, 33, 131

The principle-based taxonomy 178–180, 200
tolerance 4
topicalization 29
topic-prominent 9, 10, 12, 60, 61, 75
translation 4, 6, 66–70, 87–89, 104, 123, 130, 158, 164, 166, 170
typify 9
typology 13, 153

underlying 3, 20, 33, 40, 45, 56, 57, 80, 81, 87, 95, 109, 156, 188, 207
unmarked 7, 8, 93–95
utterance 3, 6, 13, 21, 23, 59, 61, 104, 113, 115, 117, 124, 126, 130

variability 2, 30, 125
variation 3–6, 14, 28, 30, 36, 38, 58, 67, 76, 80, 81, 102, 106, 107, 120, 131, 179, 199
verb 2–5, 7, 8, 11, 22, 24, 25, 27–30, 33–42, 44, 50, 52–54, 56, 58–62, 66, 73–82, 89–93, 96, 102, 108, 112, 125, 131, 153, 155–164, 168–175, 181, 193, 194, 202, 203
violation 16, 79, 108, 109, 111, 129, 133, 135, 140, 142–144, 147, 149, 174, 178–180, 183, 191, 199, 200, 203, 205, 208

word order 2, 4, 5, 14, 15, 42, 43, 58, 82, 108, 119, 124, 130, 133, 139, 154, 188, 190, 192, 194, 195, 201
word order principles 16, 57, 58, 63, 70, 76, 77, 80–86, 97, 98, 102, 103, 107–109, 111, 124, 131, 133, 139, 141, 142, 144, 145, 149, 152, 178, 181, 192, 200–204, 206, 207, 209